

a terrible conflict of two civilizations in the Pacific—a clash that might end civilization?

Congressman ——— and the weary old men of the quarterdeck cabals who dream and scheme the wars that younger men must fight are playing with terrific forces. The naval officer who has convinced himself that war is inevitable and may as well come is dangerous to America. Every man who is pushing two peoples toward the red whirlpool in his effort to create great fleets is a tool of those human vultures who feed upon battle fields and suck the marrow from the bones of broken nations.

We do not plead the cause of pacifism. It is as foolish and dangerous as jingoism. This Nation must maintain forces adequate for defense, but only for defense. The Navy is now adequate and efficient for this purpose. It need not and must not be increased.

The task of America and Japan is to end the hysterical agitation of phantom issues and keep dead issues buried deep. The people of Japan must not be misled. There is no will in America to make war against them. Americans must not be deceived. Japan is right well and truly bearing herself as an honorable and peace-loving nation should.

The vicious circle of armament against armament and the inevitable war has been broken and must not be again inscribed. The dark forces in both Japan and America must be checked and driven back into their shadowy caverns of greed, ambitions, and hate.

RECESS

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business to-day it take a recess until 12 o'clock noon to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Now, if there be no further business to be brought before the Senate, I ask that the Senate carry out the unanimous-consent agreement just entered into relative to taking a recess until noon to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, if there be no further business to be transacted, the Senate will stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon to-morrow.

Thereupon the Senate (at 4 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, January 8, 1925, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, January 7, 1925

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Praise ye the Lord; O give thanks unto the Lord, for His mercy endureth forever. Remember us with Thy favor and bestow upon us the Father's blessing. Let the people praise Thee, O God; let all the people praise Thee, and may they give glory unto Thy excellent name. Give us a childlike faith and bless us with the truths that are hidden even from the wise. Lead all through the journey of our days by Thy guiding hand. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE OF FRANK V. LAGUARDIA

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report from the Committee on Elections No. 2.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin presents a privileged report from the Committee on Elections No. 2, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin, from the Committee on Elections No. 2, submits the following report on the contested-election case of Henry Frank v. Fiorello H. LaGuardia.

The SPEAKER. Referred to the House Calendar.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 10020) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the World Court.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, on January 2 I submitted the following concurrent resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

Concurrent Resolution 36

Whereas modern warfare is a menace to civilization and to mankind; and

Whereas a guiding principle in the foreign policy of the United States has always been the peaceful settlement of controversies between nations by example and by the advocacy of arbitration; and

Whereas for more than a quarter of a century the United States Government has been a member of The Hague Tribunal and has long sought the creation of a permanent court of international justice; and

Whereas in effect both of the great political parties in the United States have declared in favor of the principle and purpose of such action, thus removing the proposal from the realm of partisanship, further evidenced by its indorsement by diversified civic and religious organizations such as the American Legion, the American Federation of Labor, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the American Bar Association, the League of Women Voters, and the Christian Churches of America; and

Whereas President Harding submitted to the Senate of the United States February 24, 1923, a proposal that the United States adhere to the protocol establishing an international court of justice at The Hague, with proposed reservations, which proposal has also been recommended by President Coolidge: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the proposal that the United States adhere to the protocol establishing a permanent international court of justice at The Hague, with certain reservations, recommended by President Harding and by President Coolidge, is in harmony with the traditional policy of our country, which is against aggressive war and for the maintenance of permanent and honorable peace; and that said proposal deserves to receive and ought to be given prompt and sympathetic consideration as a forward step toward outlawing war through peaceful settlement of justiciable questions.

Mr. Speaker, it is now over six years since the armistice, and the United States, the richest and most powerful Government in the world, has so far failed to either devise machinery to lessen the likelihood of another world war or adhere to the Permanent Court of International Justice for the purpose of settling international disputes by means of arbitration.

It seems to me that the time has come when we must take a definite stand either in favor of international arbitration as a step in the direction of achieving and maintaining world peace or wipe our hands like Pontius Pilate and proclaim our sole reliance on battleships and bayonets.

As a soldier and speaking for an overwhelming majority of the veterans of the World War who saw the horrors of actual warfare, comrades shot down by unseen foes at great distances, or seared by poisonous gas, I am convinced that the sacrifices will have been in vain if the United States does not play its part to carry into effect the assurances given the soldiers that they were engaged in a war to end wars. We have up to now broken faith with those of our comrades who paid the supreme sacrifice. What is there to prevent another holocaust or even minimize the possibilities of another world war?

I am opposed to the league because it is political and has failed lamentably to advance the cause of limitation of armament for which it was created, settle any of the major issues of Europe involving war, and is the practical enforcement agent of the Versailles treaty, conceived in cupidity and in a spirit of revenge, creating a dozen new Alsace-Lorraines to plague Europe for generations with wars of liberation.

The league is not a judicial organization like the Permanent Court of International Justice, but political, dominated by England and France. Were we to enter the league we could not help taking sides on questions which would involve and entangle us hopelessly in European jealousies, ambitions, and intrigues.

I am not an irreconcilable, but in my opinion it would be the part of wisdom for the United States to keep out of the League of Nations, at least until the European nations show some intention to reduce their military establishments, bond their debts, and signify a desire for peace and mutual helpfulness.

As far as the Permanent Court of International Justice is concerned it may or may not be the child of the league. If it is, it is the best thing the league has done, and the league should be given credit for it and not held up to public condemnation. The overpowering fact remains that a permanent world court of arbitration exists and is functioning serenely at The Hague, to which 52 nations have adhered, while the United States is still fighting shadows of foreign entanglements and talking in a haze about foreign intrigues and secret diplomacy.

We can very properly adhere to the protocol creating the World Court without in any degree sanctioning the league. The World Court is the only practical and constructive machine set up since the war to settle disputes between nations, big and little, on the broad principles of justice. There never has been any question raised about the ability, probity, or eminence of the judges. Prof. John Bassett Moore, America's greatest exponent of international law, is one of the 11 judges. We are assured of a square deal at the outset, as the court is judicial and not political. Can we afford to hang back any longer from taking this step in the direction of peace while at the same time palavering and professing our unquenchable love of peace?

I have introduced this resolution in the House in the first place to secure a record vote in favor of the proposal. The Members of the House of Representatives have all been elected since the message on the World Court was sent to the Senate by President Harding, and can testify regarding the attitude of the public who are wondering at the delay in presenting the proposal to the Senate and are disconcerted at the slowness of the procedure.

I am well aware that the House of Representatives has no constitutional power to negotiate or ratify treaties, but in the case of our adhering to the protocol creating the World Court which would incur annual appropriations and might require the concurrence of both Houses of Congress to limit the size of the Army and Navy, and to refrain in certain instances from declaring war the constitutional power of the House would be obviously involved.

It, therefore, seems appropriate that the House of Representatives should consider the expediency of adopting such an innovation in our dealings with foreign powers before ratification by the Senate, and express or withhold its approval in general terms when it will have some effect on subsequent proceedings.

The peace problem is by far the greatest unsolved issue and nothing else matters much in comparison to it. The adherence to the World Court is not the solution but only a step which will promote arbitration of international disputes, further limitation of armament, develop good will and peaceful relations between nations to the end that law and not war may be the arbiter of international differences.

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11248.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11248, the War Department appropriation bill, with Mr. LUCE in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11248, the War Department appropriation bill, and the Clerk will resume the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I.—MILITARY ACTIVITIES AND OTHER EXPENSES OF THE WAR DEPARTMENT INCIDENT THERETO

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF WAR

Salaries: Secretary of War, \$12,000; Assistant Secretary of War, \$10,000, and for other personal services in the District of Columbia in accordance with "The classification act of 1923," §202,174; in all, \$224,174: *Provided*, That in expending appropriations or portions of appropriations contained in this act for the payment for personal services in the District of Columbia in accordance with "The classification act of 1923," the average of the salaries of the total number of persons under any grade in any bureau, office, or other appropriation unit shall not at any time exceed the average of the compensation rates specified for the grade by such act, and in grades in which only

one position is allocated the salary of such position shall not exceed the average of the compensation rates for the grade: *Provided*, That this restriction shall not apply (1) to grades 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the clerical-mechanical service, or (2) to require the reduction in salary of any person whose compensation was fixed as of July 1, 1924, in accordance with the rules of section 6 of such act, (3) to require the reduction in salary of any person who is transferred from one position to another position in the same or different grade in the same or a different bureau, office, or other appropriation unit, or (4) to prevent the payment of a salary under any grade at a rate higher than the maximum rate of the grade when such higher rate is permitted by "The classification act of 1923," and is specifically authorized by other law.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes on the bill, but not particularly on this section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes on the bill, but not particularly on this section. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of asking consent of the committee for extra time is to bring before you certain facts and figures bearing upon an amendment which I shall offer when we reach page 37. On page 37 I shall move to strike out the figures "\$14,700,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$14,200,000," and then move to strike out all from line 11, on page 38, and line 1, on page 39.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment, which provides for reducing the total appropriation by \$500,000 and striking out the authority for the expenditure of this amount as provided in lines 11 to 25 on page 38 and part of line 1 on page 39, at this time is prompted solely for what I deem to be for the best interest of aviation generally. While I doubt the wisdom of placing the engineering department of Army aviation at Dayton, I shall not discuss for the present that phase of the question. I will say that I shall oppose any offer at any time made under the same auspices as that now before us. Since 1918, in the Sixty-fifth and Sixty-sixth Congresses, and at every opportunity I have had during the present Congress, I have consistently urged the necessity of taking inventory of figuring our costs and of uniting once and forever all of the governmental aviation activities. With the exception of the National Advisory Board for Aeronautics, there has been little or no effective successful cooperation. The board has been doing great work and is the living example of the necessity of united thought, action, and expenditures in this new and necessary branch of governmental activity.

I have some figures to-day to add to the many previous statements that I have made on the floor of the House, which those who have followed the growth and development of aviation in this country will surely find of great interest. I will first take up the specific subject of the proposed new field at Dayton, and then if the House will bear with me, I will present figures which I have been gathering for many months which will prove conclusively that the United States Government is spending as much, if not more, than other Governments in the whole world for aviation. Yet the statements made on the floor of this House so many times in the last six years remain true—that is, that the Government is not doing as much for the development of aviation as other countries. Why? For the simple reason that our activities are divided, our expenditures not wisely controlled, and large amounts used in this injudicious, competitive, disunited, uncoordinated fashion are hidden in other appropriations. But let us take up one thing at a time.

First, a new field is proposed at Dayton, Ohio. We are asked to appropriate \$500,000, which shall be available immediately, toward the transfer of the testing and experimental plant of the Air Service now located at McCook Field, Dayton, and the reestablishment on a permanent site in the same vicinity including, the provision in the appropriation says, the preparation of grounds, construction of buildings, installation of roadways and utilities, and all other expenses of whatever character connected with this project. Then we have been told that the citizens of Dayton have generously contributed the ground for this field and station.

The title has been transferred to the United States Government and we are told that we will not have to appropriate one cent for the ground. This House has had sufficient experience with gifts to the Government and that in itself should put us on notice. If there is any Member on the floor who is of the opinion that this \$500,000 is all the appropriation required to make the transfer and construct the buildings, permit me at

this time to relieve his mind of any such thought. That is not the case. I am sure the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY], who made such a splendid statement under the general debate a few days ago, will bear me out that this appropriation is simply for the initial costs of transferring the plant from one field to another. This appropriation, let it be clearly understood, is sufficient for the actual cost of the transfer of the machinery and property now at McCook Field to the new field and to start the work for tracks, roads, and then only for the foundation of the necessary buildings. My colleagues will find the itemized estimates for which this \$500,000 will be used on page 342 of the hearings held by the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations considering this very bill, and let me read them to you—

Propeller test laboratory and generator power-house foundation	\$41,000
Utillidors	85,000
Railroads	18,000
Transformer stands	3,600
Flying field	10,000
Roads	18,000
Warehouse and museum foundations	17,900
Warehouse and museum construction (parts)	60,000
Heating plant (without equipment)	60,000
Main-building foundation	75,000
Four wells	4,000
Foundation for assembly overhaul and shops	57,000
Moving that part to be done under this appropriation	10,000
Utilities	35,000
Contingent	5,100
Total	500,000

General Patrick, who testified, estimates that the total amount required is about \$4,000,000, and I say, and I am sure my colleagues who have had experience on appropriating committees before the Committee on Appropriations took over all appropriations, and the gentlemen now on the Appropriations Committee will agree that considering the cost of the foundations and the plan proposed by General Patrick as detailed in his testimony, the cost will be much nearer to \$10,000,000 than it will be to his estimate of \$4,000,000. I am not objecting to a permanent experimental station or engineering department for the Army Air Service. We must have one. It is unwise to make this appropriation at this time to settle at this particular site just because some men out in Dayton, men who have cost this Government hundreds of millions of dollars by reason of their special Dayton interests, desire a permanent field there. Why all this hurry? Why all this speed? Because they know that the question of aviation has reached that point where it must be definitely settled, and they know that when we have analyzed the cost in the last six years and taken inventory that we will settle upon a united service, and that when we do that the chances of their offer being accepted will be very slim. Hence the pressure that is brought to bear at this time. But let me read further from the hearing. The chairman of the committee [Mr. ANTHONY] asked General Patrick, who was testifying for this particular appropriation, page 339 of the hearing, December 3, 1924:

Mr. ANTHONY. You mean the present testing facilities are not sufficient?

General PATRICK. They are not sufficient to test large propellers. It can not be done * * *.

Now, get this—

Mr. ANTHONY. Has the Navy anything of that sort?

General PATRICK. They have nothing comparable to what we must have, and we are testing all that are being tested for the Navy, anyway.

Mr. ANTHONY. You propose to spend \$4,000,000 on this engineering plant. What is the Navy planning to do?

General PATRICK. I do not know, sir.

Gentlemen, that is just the trouble. The Army does not know what the Navy is doing, and the Navy does not know what the Army is doing. It is not their business to know. They are not required to know. They do not want to know as long as they can come here and get separate appropriations.

Mr. ANTHONY. We ought to know whether they are going ahead with a duplication of this plant.

General PATRICK. We are preventing duplication by having all these matters taken up with the Aeronautical Board. One of the distinct functions of the Aeronautical Board is to consider all such things and see that there is no duplication.

Why, gentlemen, you know the Aeronautical Board has no powers of this kind. They can not prevent the Navy going ahead and the Army going ahead. They simply can suggest. I

read the recommendations of the Aeronautical Board a few days ago, when we were considering the bill to authorize the Postmaster General to establish air lines for the carrying of mails, and the Aeronautical Board has been recommending for years the avoiding of duplication, yet the duplication goes on at the cost of millions of dollars. To continue the hearing. Mr. ANTHONY asks:

I do not know what the other members of the committee think about it, but personally I would be opposed to the Army going ahead and building a plant of this kind there if the Navy is going ahead with an entirely separate plant of the same kind.

Sound judgment; good legislation; which, of course, is expected from the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY]. Now, let me call the attention of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY], of the committee, that this very duplication is going on. A few days ago, when the naval appropriation bill was taken up, we appropriated the annual allowance for just such a plant. The naval plant is known as the aircraft factory of Philadelphia, and we appropriated \$1,500,000 in the bill, which passed this House a few days ago, as against \$1,511,000 for the previous fiscal year. You will find on page 530 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations considering the naval appropriation bill, January 7, 1924, the testimony of Admiral Moffett, who has the corresponding position in the Navy of General Patrick in the Army:

Mr. FRENCH. The next item covers the aircraft factory at Philadelphia, \$1,500,000 as against \$1,511,000 for 1923.

Admiral MOFFETT. That is practically the same as last year * * *.

Mr. TABER. Do you do a good deal of manufacturing there?

Admiral MOFFETT. We do as little as we possibly can; practically none now, except spare parts. It is practically manufacturing experimental types. We have no production there, practically, this year.

Mr. HARDY. Do you build any airplanes?

Admiral MOFFETT. We have built them in the past. For instance, we have an experimental type and we will build, say, three of something that is entirely new, of our own design. Take the training plane. This last year we built two types of training planes. But it is almost entirely research, experimental construction, and repair.

Exactly what the Dayton plant is doing. Absolute duplication. We have a complete plant at Philadelphia. I dare say we have some \$10,000,000 buildings on it at this time. Here are the itemized estimates covering the \$1,500,000 which we appropriated for the Philadelphia aircraft factory. They will give an idea of the extent of the work performed there:

Estimated cost under "Maintenance" of the naval aircraft factory for fiscal year 1925	
Grounds and buildings	\$7,650
Tools and machinery	34,650
Supply group	211,500
Transportation	43,650
Power group	137,850
Administration group	371,400
Shop group	271,950
Miscellaneous group	23,400
Models, tests	2,100
Repairs to aircraft	164,850
Losses, aeronautical material	900
Operating expenses, aircraft	1,035
Manufacturing	229,065
Total	1,500,000

So here we have an example. The general commanding Army Air Service admits he does not know what the Navy is doing, and the Navy seemingly does not know or care what the Army proposes to do. The subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations in charge of naval appropriations is naturally interested in developing naval appropriations. They are not familiar with the details of the program of the Army aviation. The subcommittee in charge of Army appropriations does not know the details of what the naval subcommittee is doing, and we are spending millions upon millions of dollars.

Dayton, of course, is particularly interested in Dayton. That is not our problem just now. We are responsible for the development of aviation in this country with the appropriation of the people's money, and should not be swept off our feet by the glamour and noise of real-estate promoters, contract seekers, and business men who have only their own local interests at stake. Let me read a paragraph from The Slipstream of June, 1924, the active wide-awake, forceful publication interested in Dayton and published at Dayton. As to why the Government station should stay in Dayton has been answered logically by its citizens. Location, cost, coordination from the Government standpoint of view, of course, seemingly does not enter into it.

The citizens of Dayton have given the logic and the necessity for it. Then the article goes on:

At the present time the architects are still busily engaged in mapping out plans of buildings and construction work in connection with the proposed new home of the engineering division. Tentative plans, linked with the proposed sale of the five abandoned air fields, will aggregate a sum of \$10,000,000 for the purpose of erecting permanent buildings. The expansion made possible by the move will mean an annual pay roll of from \$2,000,000 to \$5,000,000—McCook Field now has the fourth largest pay roll in Dayton. It will give employment to from 3,000 to 5,000 skilled workmen. It will mean the building of hundreds of new homes. It will give Dayton further world-wide publicity. It will increase Dayton's population many thousands. It will furnish a fitting memorial to the Wright brothers. It may result in the location here of an air academy surpassing the West Point and Annapolis institutions. It will advance the educational opportunities and standards of the community. It will focus the attention of the world upon Dayton's activities. It will attract the manufacturer of aircraft. It will draw thousands of desirable visitors. It will add to Dayton's reputation as a precision center. It will be splendid evidence of the progress and patriotism of Dayton people.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. Suppose there were 100,000 men out of employment there.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. This would be very handy, would it not?

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman believe in a Government policy of constructing buildings to give them employment?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That would be rather a costly policy to follow.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman believe in that?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No; I do not believe in constructing buildings for the sole purpose of giving men employment.

Mr. BLANTON. That is one of the gentleman's arguments he has just made.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No; I am quoting something to which I am opposed.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I did not catch the gentleman. Then he is not in favor of any such policy of the Government?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No. The gentleman will remember—

Mr. STENGLE. Do I understand the gentleman is reading somebody else's speech and he is going to oppose that speech?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No; I am reading from an article with reference to Dayton—

Mr. STENGLE. The gentleman is advertising Dayton.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Dayton is advertising itself and I am opposed to it. If the gentleman had been listening he would have understood. I hope I have made myself clear.

Can you beat it? The last place in the world that a memorial should be put up to the Wright brothers is in Dayton, Ohio. When the Wright brothers were struggling with their great invention, when they were hard up against it to finish the construction of their first machine, they got no help in Dayton, that now seeks to erect a memorial at the expense of the Government of the United States to "their" Wright brothers. Dayton should erect a memorial to the Wright brothers at their own expense. They should dig deep in their pockets and erect a magnificent memorial to these great pioneers of the air as a constant daily reminder to every citizen of Dayton of the lack of cooperation, of the utter lack of support that they gave to their native sons in the days that help was needed. Why, gentlemen, you all know the history of the Wright brothers. After their first successful experiment at Kittyhawk how discouraged they became, how embarrassed they were. Not until they went to Europe and demonstrated the actual success of heavier than air flying did they receive any assistance, moral or financial. It was the winning of some of the prizes of long standing in Europe that gave the Wright brothers their start. After their first flight, December 17, 1903, they went to Europe; for several years they sought assistance and encouragement in Dayton, Ohio, and did not get it. They sold their European patent rights in Europe. It gave them the start. The first company was organized in New York City. The Dayton-Wright Co. was not the Wright Bros. Co. by any means. It was formed during the war by Mr. E. A. Deeds, whose name should not be mentioned in the same breath with the immortal name of the Wright brothers. So for sentimental reasons, as far as I am concerned, Dayton has no right to make any demands on public funds.

The article, however, bears out the local interest in utter disregard of the best interest of the entire country and for

the good of aviation in general. I say again that the respective merits of the various locations throughout the country should be considered, not in this manner, first by one committee placing it in Philadelphia and another committee placing it in Dayton, but must be considered definitely until we are ready to consider this big subject comprehensively and thoroughly and ready to establish a definite policy for the Government and Congress to follow. We may continue for another year at McCook Field. Somebody will argue that McCook Field is not good. Perhaps it is true. That it is dangerous. The Government has had it there for many years. We have all our machinery there; we have all our equipment there; why, we have equipment and machinery and personnel enough to spend millions of dollars on experimental work each year. It can continue there just one more year. By that time I hope that the special committee of the House now investigating aviation will make its report. General Patrick has seen the light; he sees the necessity for uniting our aviation activities. I expected he would. He believed in it, I am certain, all of the time, but was in an embarrassing position. He could not publicly, perhaps, state something which he knew was diametrically opposed to the viewpoint of his superior officers. General Patrick is an excellent soldier; has put his whole heart in aviation. I had the honor of serving under him when I was in the Army, and the courage he displayed in the testimony given by him a few days ago, which, perhaps, is not in accord with the "Army viewpoint," is commendable, and will, I am sure, inspire and encourage other officers to come out and speak for the best interests of their country, rather than for the best interest of their branch of the service.

The Advisory Board of Aeronautics sees the necessity of uniting our efforts; the flying officers of the Navy understand it and know it. They are helpless in the face of the attitude assumed by their superiors. I recall when, in the Sixty-sixth Congress, I was on the Committee of Military Affairs and was acting chairman of a subcommittee which held hearings on Mr. Curry's bill for separate Air Service, that many young officers of the Navy told me privately the need of a united service, gave me information which they would not dare give before the committee, owing to the attitude of the Navy Department. We are gradually coming to an understanding. The time is not distant and the conditions are such that we shall be compelled to decide this great problem. Therefore I urge that we make no hasty, unnecessary expenditures at this time. The experimental station of the Army now at McCook Field, as I have said before, has been going on for years. It was originally transferred there from Langley Field by Deeds. This matter was before the House before.

My colleagues will remember that a similar proposition was before us the second session of the Sixty-sixth Congress. The distinguished gentleman now in charge of the bill [Mr. ANTHONY] then reported from the Committee on Military Affairs a bill for the removal of limitation for the purchase of land for construction in military posts. The bill came before us on December 11, 1919, debate starting on page 409 of the Record for that session, continuing on December 12. At that time we had three or four propositions very similar to this. One proposition for Selfridge Field, one for the field at Rantoul, Ill., another for the purchase of the Curtis-Elmwood plant at Buffalo, and another for the purchase of a field at Dayton, Ohio. It happened that the Michigan Field was the first on the list and I opposed it. There was considerable debate and I was beaten on my amendment to strike out. Then Rantoul Field came along and the distinguished floor leader of the House, Mr. Mann, of Illinois, took the floor, stated the hopelessness of trying to stop these unnecessary purchases of land, supported me in my amendment on the Selfridge Field, and called the attention of the House that it was going wildly with its eyes open into expenditures amounting to millions of dollars that were not necessary. Then the distinguished floor leader of the minority, the splendid gentleman of North Carolina, Mr. Kitchin, suggested that we start all over again and go back to Selfridge Field and offered to vote with us. On request for unanimous consent to go back to the first item, objection was made by a member of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Crago. The next item before us was the Curtis-Elmwood plant for \$1,497,202. Now gentlemen, please bear with me for just a few moments. I offered an amendment striking out this provision. On page 489 of the Record of December 12, 1919, I urged, I pleaded, I begged this House to adopt my amendment striking out that appro-

priation. Very distinguished Members took the floor in opposition to my amendment in support of the committee's bill to appropriate this amount to purchase the Curtis-Elmwood plant at Buffalo. Why, I remember the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY], ridiculed my stand, compared it to a peanut merchant, and urged the approval of the authorization to buy this plant for the amount just mentioned.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. I simply wanted to correct the statement of the gentleman. The purchase of that plant was not made for purposes of manufacturing at all. It was involved in a claim of the Government, and the plant was simply used for storage purposes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It cost us a million and a half, nevertheless.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. There was so much confusion in the Chamber that I could not understand the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] when he interrupted the gentleman. Did I understand that he withdrew that "peanut" charge or not?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Oh, we will not go into that. It is now past. I knew I was right at the time. What happened in the last five years proves the correctness of my position.

The gentleman's argument prevailed and this House appropriated the amount and purchased the plant. Now, gentlemen, mark you, we were told at that time that this plant was absolutely necessary for the development of aviation, that it was necessary for the defense of the country, that if we did not appropriate the money there was no telling what would happen to us, that everything would go to the dogs; this was on December 12, 1919. Some of us had experience of what had been going on; some of us knew and were accurately informed by officers who knew the inside workings of the department. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the floor leader of the House, Mr. Mann, was against it, and you passed it. What happened? This plant was purchased for nearly a million and a half dollars. It was never used to manufacture, it was never used as a warehouse, and on the 7th day of August, 1923, it was sold to the American Terminal Warehouse Corporation for \$755,000. Let the gentleman from Kansas explain that to the House, if he can, and justify the bill now.

Then we came to the Dayton-Wright plant. There was a provision in the same bill for \$2,740,228. I again took the floor and I again urged the defeat of the provision. I again had the support of the distinguished floor leader, Mr. Mann, and he spoke in no uncertain terms to the membership of this House. I was severely criticized at that time for making the statement that I considered the Dayton-Wright proposal and the Buffalo proposal a steal on the Treasury. The history of the Buffalo plant justifies my stand. We were told that the Dayton-Wright plant was absolutely necessary. I told the House then that this Dayton grounds would cost the Government \$800 an acre for land assessed at \$85 an acre. Again I was criticized for the stand that I took and you were told at the time that it was absolutely necessary to buy this plant. But after Mr. Mann was through the House sustained me and we saved that day over \$2,000,000. Now we have exactly the same proposition, same parties in interest, but different land.

Gentlemen, with the same earnestness that I pleaded in 1919 I now plead to you, justified and backed as I am with the history of the Buffalo plant and what happened at Dayton, not to appropriate this money at this time, which means not only an appropriation of \$500,000, but means an expenditure of nearly \$10,000,000.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. I am not sure that I get exactly the point of view of the gentleman from New York. Is he opposed to the governmental operation of this plant at Dayton because it is at Dayton or does he oppose the expenditure of the money at this time because the Army and the Navy are doing the same thing?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am urging a study of the question on its merits. I say it is very inopportune at this time to make the expenditure, because we are now all studying the question of a united Air Service. We have the McCook Field plant there now. It can continue for another year; and after we examine the whole question it will be up to us to decide whether we need this new plant at Dayton or not and what we should do in

establishing a permanent engineering plant and an experimental station.

Mr. BEGG. No doubt the gentleman knows more about the subject than I do; but, in the gentleman's opinion, does the plant at Dayton rank on a par with the others, or does it rank beneath them?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. We have only one other to compare with—that at Philadelphia, for the Navy.

Mr. BEGG. How does that compare?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I have the figures showing what has been accomplished at both plants. I say they have accomplished about as much work in each plant and have wasted about an equal amount at each plant with experiments that were not justified by past experience and by the engineering knowledge of the day. This is what I say to the gentleman from Ohio. Having at heart the interests of aviation, I want Congress to pause in appropriating money for buildings that we may not need; I want to stop some of these needless duplications, and I urge a study of this question in a comprehensive way. Then I am in favor of starting out judiciously and getting some coordination and efficiency out of the money appropriated. [Applause.]

It is said at this time that McCook Field is inadequate. Let me read the production at McCook Field since 1919, amounting to almost \$2,000,000, not including all the jobs that were started and not finished:

Number and types of airplanes built by engineering division, McCook Field, July 1, 1919, to June 30, 1923

TYPE I—SINGLE-SEATER PURSUIT AIRPLANE

(E. O. 2977, model PW-1, quantity 1)

Project, engineering and planning	\$10,641.96	
Design, drafting, and stress analysis	38,926.20	
Design, changes, and revisions	32,324.00	
		\$81,892.16
Construction of—		
Tools, jigs, patterns, forms, etc.	1,289.14	
Test specimen	1,476.69	
Wind-tunnel model	2,839.71	
Mock-up	1,762.22	
Sand-test model	23,773.28	
Flying model (1)	45,747.82	
		76,888.86

TESTS

Wind tunnel, cooling, flight, propeller, etc.	2,903.58	
Static test of sand-test model	3,662.46	
		6,566.04
		165,347.06

TYPE V—TWO-SEATER PURSUIT AIRPLANE

(E. O. 3059, model TP-1, quantity 1)

Project, engineering and planning	\$2,613.27	
Design, drafting, and stress analysis	42,688.66	
Design, changes, and revisions	15,179.61	
		60,481.54
Construction of—		
Tools, jigs, patterns, forms, etc.	2,029.53	
Wind-tunnel model	1,155.22	
Sand-test model	18,991.09	
Flying model	32,221.36	
		54,397.80

TESTS

Wind tunnel, cooling, flight, propeller, etc.	3,010.65	
Static test of sand test model	3,648.83	
		6,659.48
		121,538.82

TYPE VI—THREE-SEATER GROUND-ATTACK AIRPLANE

(E. O. 2877—model GAX—quantity 1)

Project, engineering and planning	\$1,280.43	
Design drafting and stress analysis	50,722.54	
		52,002.97
Construction of—		
Tools, jigs, patterns, forms, etc.	7,028.00	
Test specimens		
Wind-tunnel model	902.11	
Mock-up	1,590.99	
Sand-test model	30,674.14	
Flying model	71,632.13	
		112,397.37
Static test of sand-test model		8,381.63
		172,781.97

TYPE X—CORPS OBSERVATION AIRPLANE

(E. O. 3030—model CO-1—quantity 1)

ALL METAL

Project, engineering and planning	\$3,017.08	
Design, drafting, and stress analysis	50,362.01	
Design changes and revisions	36,509.02	
		89,888.11

Construction of—		
Tools, jigs, patterns, forms, etc.	\$9,735.89	
Test specimens	1,164.79	
Wind-tunnel model	1,725.91	
Sand-test model	30,663.53	
Flying model	48,028.94	
	\$91,319.06	
Static test of sand-test model	3,684.96	
	184,892.13	
(E. O. 3026; model, CO-2; quantity, 1)		
Project engineering and planning	\$3,262.06	
Design, drafting, and stress analysis	64,576.23	
Design changes and revisions	13,118.42	
	80,956.71	
Construction of—		
Tools, jigs, patterns, forms, etc.	9,624.89	
Wind-tunnel model	1,160.45	
Mock-up	2,874.01	
Sand-test model	23,260.07	
Flying model	39,897.52	
	76,316.94	
TESTS		
Flight and cooling tests	170.69	
Static test of sand-test model	3,195.37	
	3,366.06	
	160,639.71	

TYPE XV—TRAINING AIRPLANE

(E. O. 2947; model, TW-1; quantity, 1)

Project engineering and planning	\$3,004.70	
Design, drafting, and stress analysis	52,413.26	
	55,417.96	
Construction of—		
Tools, jigs, patterns, forms, etc.	682.04	
Test specimens	339.46	
Mock-up	1,462.78	
Sand-test model	26,664.30	
Flying model	46,934.89	
	76,083.47	
TESTS		
Flight and cooling tests	1,000.98	
Static test of sand-test model	3,449.65	
	4,450.63	
	135,952.06	

TYPE X—CORPS OBSERVATION AIRPLANE

(E. O. 2911; Model XB-1A; quantity, 2)

Project engineering and planning	\$1,584.95	
Design and drafting	37,251.34	
	38,836.29	
Construction of—		
Tools, jigs, patterns, forms, etc.	1,209.35	
Flying models (2)	73,973.03	
	75,182.38	
	114,018.67	
(E. O. 3114; Model CO-5; quantity, 1)		
Designing and drafting	\$11,675.57	
Design changes and revisions	2,357.51	
	14,033.08	
Construction of—		
Tools, jigs, forms, patterns, etc.	1,071.01	
Flying model	32,349.51	
	33,420.52	
Flight and cooling tests	561.87	
	48,015.47	

TYPE I—SINGLE-SEATER PURSUIT AIRPLANE

(E. O. 1178; Model V. C. P. 1; quantity, 1)

Costs not available on this airplane. Work started before cost system was installed.

Above costs include all expenses incurred in connection with the orders, whether paid for from experimental funds or from other sources. The overhead includes increased compensation, telephone and telegraph expense, military supervision, trucking, rent of field, depreciation of plant and equipment, etc.

Both the Army and the Navy experimental plants or factories, whatever you may call them, have wasted money. Of course, a waste of money is expected in experimental work, but both plants have undertaken experiments which experience and good common sense do not justify. You all remember the noise and publicity attached to the Barling bomber. We were supposed to have two for \$350,000. Only one was built, and it cost \$500,000. All that could be said for it is that it is big—just big. Big and clumsy, big and useless, big and worthless, and half a million dollars was wasted on that job. As an experiment it was useless. It did not prove successful in England, and yet half a million dollars and a year and a half time was wasted on it. There it is now in Dayton, worthless, useless, a big piece of incumbrance. Then the Navy, to outdo the Army, they were building a bigger plane. You saw photographs of parts of it. It was sur-

rounded with mystery and secrecy. Distinguished aeronautical engineers from abroad were shown parts of it. The country was told about this giant, twice as big as the Barling bomber, which was then being produced by the Army, that was to be produced by the Navy. What happened? Nothing. The job was never completed. I don't believe it ever will be completed. It is well that it should not. Another experimental job started and not finished was a thousand horsepower engine. Hundreds of thousands of dollars was spent on it and then discontinued. Dozens of airplanes designed and built by the Government and development stopped.

These are specific instances of waste and competitive waste instead of unified economy and coordinated efficiency.

I have been unable to get complete figures from the Navy as to what it has produced at their Philadelphia plant, because they have a different system of bookkeeping. The best I could obtain for the years 1919-1922 was the following list and explanation, which shows the difficulty if not the impossibility of knowing just what we are doing and how much it is costing us:

Type, number, and unit cost of aircraft built at Naval Aircraft Factory since 1919

Year	Type	Quantity manufactured	Unit cost
1919-20	F-5-L	50	24,069.16
	M-F	80	8,722.66
	SA-1	3	3,071.85
	SA-2	3	5,297.31
	HS-3	2	28,252.54
	NC	6	123,336.00
	VE-7-G	10	12,382.06
1920-21	VE-7-GF	10	13,335.46
	VE-7	16	6,720.87
	VE-7-SF	34	7,114.16
	M-81	36	7,561.63
	PT-1	15	16,588.20
1921-22	TS-1	5	17,128.13
	TS-2	4	13,756.20
	PT-2	18	16,090.70
Total			303,421.70

NOTE.—The above unit costs represent average costs to manufacture the plane only and do not include the engines, ordnance equipment, or radio. These items of cost are not included, as this equipment is not standard. Some planes were not equipped with ordnance and some were not equipped with radio. Further, the invoice cost of engines, even of the same type, varies widely, probably depending upon the date of manufacture. For these reasons it is believed that any comparisons of cost to manufacture can be more intelligently made if the cost of this equipment is eliminated.

Just a word now, if I may continue, on the general subject of aviation and the aviation industry. The way we have been appropriating for the various aviation activities of the Government has been confusing, to say the least. Recently we have all heard that the Government is not doing enough for aviation. Perhaps I have made the same statement. What we should say is that the Government is not treating this subject intelligently or efficiently. The Navy comes in yearly with about fifteen or sixteen million dollars. The Army has in the bill before us \$14,000,000. Whether we take either one of these figures and compare it with Great Britain or France, of course, the one figure is far below. If you ask the Army what it has received in the last four years for aviation, it will tell you in 1920, \$25,000,000; in 1921, \$23,000,000; in 1922, \$19,200,000; in 1923, \$12,700,000. If you ask the Navy, it will say: 1919-20, \$25,000,000; 1920-21, \$20,000,000; 1921-22, \$13,413,431; 1922-23, \$14,683,950; 1923-24, \$14,647,174. But even these figures are not correct, nor do they tell the whole story. The fact is that the allowance to both the Army and Navy for aviation is much more than that which would appear by the amounts which we appropriate under the item Air Service in each of the appropriation bills. For instance, in 1923 we appropriated for the Air Service \$12,700,000 for the Army, as I have just stated, but the actual amount expended for the Air Service is \$28,144,131.97, while for the same year, for the Navy, it appears on the face that we spent \$14,655,345, which I have just quoted, but the actual cost of naval aviation for which we appropriated was \$34,759,807.01. When a comparison was recently made of what the United States is spending for aviation, the figure of \$12,648,397.41, Army appropriation, was added to the \$14,655,345, and we are told that we had spent but \$27,303,742.41. It was compared with the total appropriations of England, France, Italy, or Japan and the argument was urged that we are not spending enough, while, as a matter of fact, for that very year the real amount

is \$67,241,327.95, and if any unfavorable comparison is to be made with England or France or other countries, it is not with what we appropriate but what we get for the money that we spend. Now, to explain the figure, the Army appropriation for 1922-23 under the item appropriation Air Service of the Army is \$12,648,397.41, add—

Cost of Army Air Service, fiscal year 1922-23

From appropriation, "Air Service, Army"	\$12,648,397.41
From appropriation, "Salaries, Office of Chief of Air Service"	195,000.00
Signal Corps	182,000.00
Medical Department	87,749.18
Ordnance Department	507,894.00
Quartermaster Corps	4,041,938.00
Pay of the Army	10,459,715.00
Mileage of the Army	41,478.38

Making a total of..... 28,144,131.97

(Hearings, Subcommittee on Appropriations, February 6, 1924, General Patrick testifying.)

The Navy total expenditures were estimated as follows:

STATEMENT SHOWING EXPENDITURES DURING THE FISCAL YEAR 1922-23 FROM NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR AVIATION

Aviation, Navy	\$14,655,345.00
Printing and binding	10,000.00
Salaries, Navy Department	116,708.72
Pay of the Navy	6,774,134.00
Pay, Marine Corps	666,965.22
Provisions, Navy	854,669.06
Provisions, Marine Corps	131,765.00
Ordnance and ordnance stores	300,000.00
Naval Reserve Force	137,322.38
Maintenance, supplies, and accounts	240,000.00
Medical Department	50,000.00
Transportation, Navy	56,000.00
Fuel and transportation	12,600.00
Pay, miscellaneous	30,000.00
Surplus war material	10,724,297.69

Total..... 34,759,807.01

(Hearings before Subcommittee of Committee on Appropriations January 7, 1924.)

Included in the \$67,241,327 are the following items: Bureau of Engineering for aviation, as testified by Admiral Moffett before the Naval Subcommittee on Appropriations, \$266,630.08; Bureau of Construction and Repairs for aviation, \$343,301; pay of the crew of the *Langley* and tenders, \$1,350,000; operating cost of *Langley* and tenders, \$227,457.89. In addition to this it is fair to add \$250,000 appropriated for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; then, of course, it is only fair to add the \$50,000,000 being spent for aircraft carriers. This total amount quoted by me does not include the overhead charges in other departments of the Army and Navy, such as Medical, Inspector General, Judge Advocate General, The Adjutant General, and other overheads. If all these were included and properly itemized as they are in the British aviation, where they have a united service, or as they are in the French service or in the Italian service, I feel confident that the figures would show that this Government is spending near to \$100,000,000 a year for aviation, and that since the war it has spent nearly a half a billion dollars for that same purpose. Yet General Mitchell, testifying before a committee a few days ago, made the startling statement that we had only 20 Army airplanes fit for war service, and the testimony of the Navy was to the effect that we had a little over 200, I believe, fit for war service. Gentlemen, does that not justify that we halt, that we go easy on appropriations for the coming year, take stock, examine our inventory, unite these services, create efficiency, and produce economy? I believe that it does.

At this time I want to give credit to that energetic, live-wire publisher, Mr. Lester D. Gardner, the editor of *Aviation*, for the painstaking services which he has rendered in the research and study of the cost of aviation. No better friend of American aviation than Mr. Gardner exists in the country. He has supported every effort for a better Air Service. I consider him one of the best experts on Government aviation in the country, and I am sure Mr. Gardner is convinced that a united Air Service is absolutely essential for the best interests of the country and for the development of the Air Service.

To further illustrate the confused condition of our aviation activities, not only is it possible to get accurately the total cost of aviation to the country, but it is impossible to get accurate figures from any one department. I will read, although it is quite lengthy, an article appearing in this week's *Aviation*, showing that in reply to an inquiry as to the total expenditures of the Army three different statements were made, and the last statement is given as only approximately

correct. The first statement was made June 14, 1924, the second statement July 28, 1924, and the last statement at an even later date, with the proviso that it is approximately correct. The article is so replete with figures, and the table furnished is so illuminating, so convincing that the department does not know accurately what it is spending, as well as showing the total amounts spent for aviation, that I consider it indeed a valuable document. Here is what it says:

The investigation which *Aviation* has been conducting into the cost of aviation to the Government has brought from the Secretary of War one of the most significant letters on the subject of costs that has ever been written. It is in reply to a letter written by *Aviation* on July 29, 1924, questioning certain figures given by General Patrick to the House Appropriations Committee and subsequent revisions. The admission of error after error justifies the skepticism with which the figures were received. In fairness to General Patrick it should be stated that the corrections, except in one very important particular, concerned errors made by other departments than the Air Service.

DISCOVERY OF TEN MILLIONS

The great change contained in this new information is the increase of \$10,389,811 by the inclusion of the cost of such supplies as Liberty engines that were paid for during the war. These supplies do, however, represent cost, and as the Navy included an almost equal amount in its figures it seems proper that the Army cost should also indicate a similar charge. General Patrick was specifically asked by the committee: "Have you any figures which will show what the total cost of the Air Service has been for the last fiscal year?" It should be noted that "cost" was asked for, and not expenditures from appropriations. General Patrick said he thought that naval "appropriations" were greater than military. He was then asked: "If you have any means of getting the figure, I wish you would put a statement in the record showing the total amount expended for the Navy Air Service and for the Army Air Service for the last year." Mr. Anthony of the committee specifically asked that General Patrick separate "the amount of surplus property used." It will be seen that three different words are used—"cost," "appropriations," and "expenditures."

The table included in the hearings gave the figure \$28,144,131.97 as the "cost of the Army Air Service, fiscal year 1923." *Aviation* questioned this figure owing to the omission of the cost of surplus war material that was specifically asked for, and which item made the Navy costs appear higher than those of the Army. In reply to our questioning this figure, Assistant Secretary of War Davis sent us "later and more accurate data for the same year." This also was headed "cost." It showed an error of \$5,786,502.70 and reduced the "cost" to \$22,357,629.37. (*Aviation*, p. 861, August 11, 1924.) But the cost of surplus engines, DH's, and other supplies were not included.

HOW COST FIGURES VARY

At this point the public was given the impression that the cost of the two services was as follows:

Naval Air Service	\$34,759,807.01
Army Air Service	22,357,629.37

Believing that this gave a false impression, *Aviation* asked the War Department eight specific questions, and after five months of investigation, correcting of errors, and making of changes a new set of figures are now presented which presents the comparative costs, as follows:

Naval Air Service	\$34,759,807.01
Army Air Service	36,341,276.92

In the latter figure is included the cost of surplus material given by General Patrick in reply to our question No. 2.

Aviation stated (August 11, 1924) that there was an error of \$6,000,000 in the statement made by General Patrick to Congress, but the answer to our request as to how this error occurred reveals the astonishing fact that the Quartermaster Department had again made an error of \$3,500,000. In other words, more than half of the "lost" \$6,000,000 had been found. *Aviation* believed that the lumping of items under the heading "Procurement for issue" of \$4,467,732.01 should be more explicit. This information is supplied in answer to question 6.

Under the general heading of "Experimental and research work" was a lump sum of \$2,927,160.72. An itemization of this figure shows that \$1,828,853.84 was spent for the pay of civilian personnel. But the most curious item to be included under such a head is the payment to an inventor under the head "Christmas patent" of \$62,500. If this is for "experimental and research work" it seems a remarkable extension of the terms.

Equally interesting is the confirmation of the fact that in the fiscal year 1924 only \$141,904 was spent for new engines. This indicates a lack of coordination in production flow somewhere.

LETTER FROM SECRETARY WEEKS

The letter of the Secretary of War indicates how carelessly the costs of our air services to our Government have been handled heretofore. It has been the purpose of Aviation, in continuing this investigation, to bring out the point that no one in the Government knew exactly what our aviation was costing, that there were no accurate figures available for the public, and that those interested were entitled to a clear itemized statement of the huge sums being expended for our air services so that results could be compared with costs.

There follow three statements: First, the letter from Secretary Weeks; second, the answers to the eight questions asked by Aviation; and third, a table giving detailed explanations of all errors and changes:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. LESTER D. GARDNER,
President The Gardner, Moffat Co. (Inc.),
225 Fourth Avenue, New York City.

DEAR MR. GARDNER: Your letter of July 29, 1924, to the Hon. D. F. Davis, Assistant Secretary of War, requesting information regarding certain differences between statements furnished you concerning Air Service expenditures and asking for fuller details of same was forwarded to the Chief of Finance with directions to make a complete answer to same. In order to do this it was necessary for him to make a detailed examination of vouchers, hence the delay in making reply.

The results of his investigation appear on the attached table showing the two statements furnished you, their differences, with brief explanatory remarks, and the final and revised statement for the fiscal year 1923. There are also attached hereto the answers to your numbered questions.

It will be seen that the statement sent you on July 28 concerning 1923 was erroneous in that it did not include all of the items shown in the first statement. This was due to a misunderstanding as to what items should be included. In correcting this the first statement, which was an estimate, has also been corrected, the final result appearing on the table under the heading "Revised statement."

Regretting the necessary delay, but trusting that the information given will be satisfactory, I remain

Yours very truly,

JOHN W. WEEKS, Secretary of War.
[Inclosure]

The following information is in reply to the numbered questions in your letter of July 29, 1924:

"Question 1. The Navy (p. 525, App. Comm. Hearings, Navy Dept., 1925) gives about \$990,000 for provisions for the Bureau of Aeronautics in 1923. Does the figure in your tables for 1923 for quartermaster of \$502,066.74 cover the same general items?"

Answer. No. The corresponding figure for Army aviation in 1923 is included in the amount reported under "Quartermaster Corps" in my letter to you on June 14 and also appears in the accompanying table in the column headed "Correct statement," the specific amount being \$1,137,291. This item appears in answer to question 3 (post).

"Question 2. The Navy (ibid.) includes \$10,724,297 as surplus war material used in 1923. How is this item included in your 1923 figures? If not, what was the value of surplus war material used?"

[NOTE.—General Patrick, in his article in Current History Magazine dealing with the cost of war aviation, deducted the value of the supplies on hand, such as Liberty engines, and made public the figures with the statement that the supplies on hand were assets. If they are deducted from war cost, they should be included in present costs, as is done by the Navy. Otherwise a false impression will be given the public.]

Answer. The following reply of the Chief of Air Service to this question is quoted:

"The figures appearing in the statement inserted in page 903 of the hearings on War Department appropriations bill for 1925 conducted by the House Appropriations Subcommittee gave the cost of the Army Air Service for the fiscal year 1923 from current appropriations and do not include the value of surplus war material issued. The value of surplus war material issued in fiscal year 1923 is approximately \$10,389,811. The unit prices used in computing this figure have been derived from war contract costs. All of the war surplus airplanes and motors issued had to be reworked in varying degrees, and the cost of such work is reflected in the figures given for the expenditures under the current appropriations for the fiscal year 1923."

"Question 3. What were the costs included in General Patrick's figures for the Quartermaster Corps of \$4,041,000 and left out in the latter tables, making the figures \$502,066.74?"

Answer. The following tabulation shows the difference between the two statements:

Item	General Patrick's statement sent to you June 14, 1924	Second statement sent to you July 28, 1924
Subsistence of the Army.....	\$1,137,291.00	
Regular supplies.....	770,824.00	\$139,892.33
Clothing and equipage.....	213,726.00	710.00
Incidental expenses.....	291,623.00	24.00
Army transportation.....	1,140,971.00	255,566.85
Water and sewers.....	128,843.00	13,815.95
Barracks and quarters.....	226,603.00	49,937.60
Barracks and quarters, Philippine Islands.....	15,810.00	
Roads, walks, wharves, and drainage.....	33,895.00	7,831.08
Shooting galleries and ranges.....	1,678.00	
Construction and repair of hospitals.....	55,906.00	572.27
Increased compensation.....	44,678.00	
Buildings and facilities of aviation stations, etc., Army.....		33,529.26
Military post exchanges.....		187.40
Total.....	4,041,938.00	502,066.74

See also item 6 with explanatory remarks and revised statement on accompanying table.

"Question 4. What reduced the pay of the Army item \$10,450,000 to \$7,985,424.60?"

Answer. See item 7 with explanatory remarks on accompanying table.

"Question 5. On page 952 (ibid.) General Patrick testified that \$400,000 was expended for helium in 1923 and \$500,000 in 1924. Under what heading is this included in the recent tables?"

Answer. These amounts are included respectively in the amounts of \$727,359.15 and \$867,071.18 under heading "supplies" in the table referred to which was the second inclosure to letter of July 28, 1924.

"Question 6. In 1924 \$4,467,732.01 is under 'procurement for issue.' \$3,360,261.08 is listed for aircraft. Can he have a further itemization of the difference?"

Answer. This difference is analyzed by the Chief of Air Service as follows:

Under procurement for issue in 1924, \$3,360,261.08 is listed for aircraft out of a total expended of \$4,467,732.01. The difference of \$1,107,470.93 is made up of the following amounts:

Corps of Engineers.....	\$6,211.88
Chemical Warfare Service.....	5,866.82
<i>Air Service</i>	
Airplanes, repair and alteration of.....	\$707,932.04
Airships and balloons, repair and alteration of.....	47,148.50
Engines, repair and alteration of.....	187,650.15
Instruments and accessories, repair and alteration of.....	53,989.52
Hangars, repair and alteration.....	91,365.63
Minor items.....	7,306.30
	1,095,392.23
	1,107,470.93

"Question 7. \$2,927,160.72 is given under 'Experimental and Research.' May we have an itemized statement of the main expenditures under this head?"

Answer. The following reply of the chief of Air Service is quoted: Itemized statement of the amount given under "Experimental and Research" as follows:

Medical research.....	\$7,310.59
Pay of civilian personnel.....	1,823,352.34
Travel of civilian personnel.....	23,000.00
Experimental and research (supplies, equipment, etc.).....	988,537.87
Printing equipment.....	9,439.92
Christmas patent.....	62,500.00
Transportation of supplies.....	520.00
License fees.....	12,500.00
	2,927,160.72

"Question 8. Was only \$141,904 used for aircraft engines during 1924? If so, how is the cost of Liberty engines accounted for? As war cost or present cost?"

Answer. The Chief of Air Service states that \$141,904 was expended for new aircraft engines in fiscal year 1924. No contracts were let during the fiscal year 1924 for the reworking of war surplus engines. It should be further noted, however, that the statement in question does not purport to give the cost of war materials utilized, inasmuch as it gives only actual expenditures of funds from the appropriations considered.

Tabulation showing statements furnished, their differences with explanatory remarks, and a revised statement

Items	First statement June 14, 1924	Second statement July 28, 1924	Increase or decrease of second statement over first	Explanatory remarks	Revised statement (approx- imately correct)
1. Air Service	\$12,648,357.41	\$12,648,357.41			\$12,648,357.41
2. Salaries, Office Chief of Air Service	195,000.00	218,949.15	+23,949.15	This difference is due to the amount for "increased compensation" being included in the second statement and not in the first.	218,949.15
3. Signal Corps	162,000.00	162,000.00			162,000.00
4. Medical Department	87,749.18	70,138.72	-17,610.46	The difference in this case is caused by an error in omitting from the second statement two items, totaling \$19,072.55, viz: Costs at stations other than flying fields..... \$16,294.36 Cost to appropriation "Hospital care, Canal Zone gar- risons"..... 2,778.19 The first statement which was an estimate, also omitted small sums totaling \$1,512.09. The revised statement is shown.	89,261.27
5. Ordnance Department	507,894.00	667,854.00	+159,960.00	The second statement carefully compiled by the Ordnance Department shows that the following items were omitted from the first, which was only an estimate: For manufacture and experimental work of machine guns, accessories, etc., increased by..... \$107,271.00 Storage and issue (omitted)..... 28,386.00 Transportation Air Service property, etc. (omitted)..... 16,420.00 Fuel and gasoline (omitted)..... 2,373.00 Maintenance of flying fields increased by..... 5,505.00 159,960.00	667,854.00
6. Quartermaster Corps	4,041,938.00	502,066.74	-3,539,871.26	An error was made in this item. The first statement, an estimate, was fairly accurate and should not have been changed; there were omitted from it, however, two items amounting to \$33,716.66, viz: Buildings and facilities at aviation stations, etc..... \$33,529.26 Military post exchanges..... 187.40 The second statement is also in error in that it only shows expenditures from quartermaster appropriations for the exclusive use of the Air Service and does not include the pro rata share of the Air Service from other quartermaster appropriations. The revised statement is shown.	4,075,654.06
7. Pay of the Army	10,459,715.00	7,985,424.60	-2,474,290.40	In explaining this difference it should be stated that costs of pay of the Army are not kept by branches, and that the figures in the first statement were a hurriedly prepared estimate in response to a request from the congressional committee. There is no record to show how these figures were arrived at. The second statement was carefully computed, based on detailed strength reports of the Air Service and is therefore as nearly accurate as an estimate can be made.	7,985,424.60
8. Mileage	41,478.38	33,206.00	-8,272.38	The difference arose in this case through reporting in the first statement the amount allotted to the Air Service and in the second statement the amount obligated. The records now show the actual expenditures to be \$34,382.08, the sum shown in the revised statement.	34,382.08
9. Chemical Warfare Service		8,604.00	+8,604.00	These figures were not received in time to be included in the first statement which was prepared for the committee hearings. They should have been included and are now shown.	8,604.00
10. Engineers		60,978.75	+60,978.75	In reply to a request for data for the first statement, nothing was furnished as chargeable to Engineer appropriations. This was possibly due to a misunderstanding as to what was required, as the only items listed were procurements by the Engineers from Air Service appropriations, which had already been included in the Air Service report. The error was corrected in the second statement and now includes cost of supplies furnished from Engineer appropriation.	60,978.75
Total	28,144,131.97	22,357,629.37	-5,786,502.60		25,951,465.92

First statement (estimated)..... \$28,144,131.97
Revised statement (computed)..... 25,951,465.92

Difference..... 2,192,666.05

Are we to continue in this fashion? The responsibility rests with Congress. Each department is doing the best that it can, guided by its own esprit de corps, fighting to maintain its own supremacy, and will continue to ask for money, and we will continue to appropriate. Duplications will continue, waste will continue in the increase, and only efficiency will decrease. What do I mean by duplications?

1. Army, Navy, and Post Office all running experimental division, factories, and repair shops with duplicating overheads.

2. Army and Marine Corps doing the same work on land machines.

3. Flying fields all over the country, side by side all maintaining mechanics and officers; millions could be saved by consolidation.

4. Training in flying being done by the services at different places.

5. Competition for airplanes keeps cost of aircraft higher.

6. Both Army and Navy charged with defense of coast.

7. By buying the same airplanes piecemeal instead of in quantities and together costs are increased—Martin bombers bought by Army and Navy from four different factories (Martin, L. W. F., Curtiss, and Aeromarine).

Here is what that gallant flyer, fighting Gen. Bill Mitchell, says about it. General Mitchell is an intrepid flyer, a gallant soldier, has not only physical courage, but has moral courage. At the risk of losing his star he has since 1918, at every opportunity, officially and publicly, urged the unification of aerial activities, the stoppage of waste, extravagance, and the coordination of our air forces, and only recently General Mitchell said, and I want to quote his cryptic, forceful statement:

The only possible solution of our aeronautical problem is a department of aviation. We have spent something like \$450,000,000 on aviation since the war. What have we to show for it? It has been used up largely in overhead by the various agencies of the Government that employ aviation. None of these really know how to use it. If this amount had been put into a department specifically charged with the development of aviation, we would have done as much as any other country.

Just a word as to the aviation industry of the country. At this stage of the development of flying the Government really is the only customer. There will be but small orders here and there for flying machines for a few years, but we can only develop an industry if we can produce planes, and, above all, motors. I need not express myself again on the Liberty motor. Older Members ridiculed my stand years ago when I stated that the Liberty motor was not the final word in aviation motors. I recall that I had to fight in the committee to prevent the continued manufacture of the Liberty motors after the war, although we had 20,000 surplus motors on hand.

Some of the Members will recall my resolution of inquiry in the Sixty-sixth Congress asking for the actual number of motors on hand and their condition, for we were groping in the dark. We spent one whole afternoon passing that resolution, and when the information was finally furnished the House, the country was startled to learn we had thousands of thousands of motors. During the war, everything was built around the Liberty motor; inventive genius of the industry in this country has been stifled since the war in order to build around the Liberty motor, now antiquated and obsolete. The Navy can use it, it is true, where a heavy 400 horsepower is needed,

but we can not stop progress just because we have Liberty motors on hand. I would be willing to give a Liberty motor away to any individual or any concern who can furnish the Government with the assurance that they will build a motor around it.

While we have spent several million dollars for planes, the orders have been spasmodic, uncertain, and a sound permanent industry has really not been developed. The system of the departments each having its favorites, to permit one concern to develop a plane, to buy that plane and a few more perhaps from the original firm designing it, and then placing the order for duplicates to mushroom, small organizations, without heavy overhead engineering expense, has been hardly fair. At this stage of the industry we should continue, of course, our competitive system of bidding, but the work should be divided as equally as possible among such concerns as are able to guarantee to the Government that they have the capital, the engineering ability, and the experience necessary to do the work. The system of sending out bids and then modifying the contract afterwards should be discontinued. The system of sending out bids for a few planes with the inside information that a greater number is to be ordered should likewise be discontinued. In other words, we should establish the policy that no one any longer is going to get something for nothing because he happens to be selling aviation equipment. The Government should treat the industry fairly and has the right to expect the industry to treat the Government fairly. After a great deal of difficulty I have succeeded in obtaining the various types of planes ordered by the Army and Navy from private manufacturers, the amount expended on each, the amount of the order, showing the original contract cost and changes in the contract price subsequently made. I have purposely held these figures for some time in order not to embarrass any particular manufacturer or to make public what might be deemed private business information. All work, however, with the Government is public; all of these orders included in the list which I have, I have been informed, have been delivered, so that no manufacturer, individual, or company can in any way be embarrassed by the publication of these figures. They are illuminating; they show first the manner in which small orders were given, the increases made after the contract was awarded, as well as the total amount spent by the Government for equipment, other than that manufactured in Government plants. Please follow these figures:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, September 18, 1923.

Hon. F. H. LA GUARDIA,
276 Fifth Avenue, New York City, N. Y.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In reply to your letter of July 18, asking for certain information in regard to the procurement of aircraft by the Army Air Service, the following is furnished you:

The appropriations for the four fiscal years since the close of the war are as follows:

1920	-----	\$25,000,000
1921	-----	33,000,000
1922	-----	19,200,000
1923	-----	12,700,000

The following types of airplanes have been built, or are building, since the war:

Remodeled DH-4s: These planes have been changed from the war-produced model by moving the pilot's cockpit back of the gasoline tank and moving the landing gear forward several inches, thus providing a plane somewhat safer than that made during the war. This plane is used for observation, light bombardment, and general utility. The cost of remodeling varies from about \$1,100 immediately after the war to \$2,300 at the present time, the increase being due chiefly to deterioration in the planes, which requires more repair work. Large numbers have been remodeled by this method. In addition, 50 were remodeled in 1923 and 100 in 1924 by rebuilding with a steel fuselage at a cost of \$2,400 each. Further rebuilding of the DH-4s will be according to this plan.

XB-1A's: Forty-two of these were ordered in 1920 at a cost of about \$12,300 each. This is a two-seater corps observation plane.

SE-5A's: Fifty of these planes have been built since the war with certain improvements over the war-produced model at a cost of about \$4,000 per plane. They are being used for training purposes at the advanced flying school.

MB-3's: Sixty-two of these were ordered in 1920 at a cost of approximately \$15,000 each. This is a single-seater pursuit airplane.

MB-3A's: Two hundred of these were ordered in 1921 at a cost of approximately \$7,600 each. This is an improved and strengthened

MB-3. It is the present standard pursuit plane and all pursuit squadrons are equipped with it.

Oreoco D's: Fifty were ordered in 1920 at a cost of approximately \$11,600 each. This was a single seater pursuit plane which has been obsolete and taken out of service.

PW-5's: Ten of these were ordered in 1922 at a cost of about \$10,400 each. This is a single seater pursuit plane of high performance.

PW-8's: Twenty-five of these have just been ordered (1924) at a cost of \$16,000 each. This is a single seater, steel fuselage, pursuit plane showing the highest performance yet obtained.

MB-2's: Twenty of these were ordered in 1920 at a cost of approximately \$53,000 each. This is a short distance night bomber, dual engine, capable of carrying 2,000 pounds of bombs.

NB-81's: Eighty-five of these were ordered in 1921 and 25 in 1922 at an average cost of approximately \$23,000. This is an improvement on the MB-2 mentioned above and is used for bombing.

GA-X's: Ten of these were ordered in 1920 at a cost of approximately \$46,000 each. This plane is a three seater, armored, dual engined, ground attack plane.

The "Ocel" is a giant bombing plane purchased in 1920 at a cost of \$138,000. This plane is capable of lifting 4,000 pounds in bombs.

NB-L-1: This plane was ordered in 1920 at a total cost of \$351,000. It is the largest bomber built in the United States and is capable of carrying 10,000 pounds in bombs.

VE-7's: Seven of these planes were ordered in 1921 at a cost of \$12,000 each. This is a two seater training airplane of high performance.

VE-9's: Twenty-seven of these were ordered in 1922 at a cost of approximately \$9,100 each. This is an improvement over the VE-7 mentioned above.

TA-3's: Ten of these were ordered in 1922 at a cost of approximately \$8,100 each. This is a primary training plane equipped with an air-cooled motor and was purchased for service test.

TW-3's: Twenty of these were ordered in 1923 at a cost of about \$8,000 each. This is a primary training plane with water-cooled motor and steel fuselage.

Messenger airplanes: Six of these were ordered in 1921 at a cost of approximately \$4,300 each, and 20 were ordered in 1922 at a cost of about \$3,500 each. This is a small messenger plane equipped with air-cooled motor, capable of landing in very small fields.

Loening seaplanes: Eight of these were ordered in 1923 at a cost of about \$13,500 each. This is a high-speed, duralumin-body seaplane used for rescue purposes at stations on the water.

Transport airplanes: Ten of these were ordered in 1923 at a cost of \$12,700 each. This is a plane designed for transportation of supplies and personnel.

In addition there have been a number of experimental airplanes, built for development purposes, such as the Curtiss, Verville-Sperry, and Thomas-Morse special speed planes.

The following airships have been purchased since the war:

AA pony blimp: Two of these were purchased in 1920 at a total cost of \$51,500. This is a small airship of approximately 38,500 cubic feet.

Roma: This was purchased in 1920 from the Italian Government at a cost of \$194,000. It was a large semirigid airship with a capacity of 1,200,000 cubic feet.

Coastal airships: Three of these were purchased in 1920 at a total cost of \$264,000. The capacity is about 180,000 cubic feet.

Pony blimp: Two of these were purchased in 1921 at a cost of \$47,000. This ship has a capacity of 37,500 cubic feet.

Military airship: This was purchased in 1921 at a cost of \$147,000. This ship has a capacity of 180,000 cubic feet.

U. S. M. B.: This ship was purchased in 1921 at a cost of \$34,000. Its capacity is 47,500 cubic feet.

Towing airship: This airship was purchased in 1921 at a cost of \$45,000. Its capacity is 40,000 cubic feet.

TC's: Three of these were purchased in 1922 at a cost of \$82,000 each, and three more in 1923 at a cost of \$45,000 each. These ships are twin-engined training ships of capacity of about 200,000 cubic feet.

A's: Two of these were ordered in 1922 at a cost of \$72,000 each. They are twin engined with a capacity of about 130,000 cubic feet.

RS-1. This ship was ordered in 1922 at a cost of \$475,000. It is a long-range reconnaissance airship, semirigid, with four Liberty motors, and has a capacity of about 665,000 cubic feet. * * *

Sincerely yours,

DWIGHT T. DAVIS,
Acting Secretary of War.

Statement of obligations incurred by United States Army Air Service under contracts for airplanes, airships, and balloons, placed with contractors indicated below during the period of July 1, 1919, to June 30, 1923

Contractor	1920	1921	1922	1923	Total
Aeromarine Plane & Motor Corporation	\$229,151.75	\$183,150.00	\$693,970.80		\$1,106,272.55
Airships Manufacturing Co.		84,542.30		\$133,494.00	218,036.30
B. A. T. Co., through M. A. London		9,600.00			9,600.00
Boeing Airplane Co.	686,120.63	1,836,485.47	92,645.70	172,663.89	2,787,915.69
Chance Vought Corporation	13,965.00	84,966.00	277,293.35		376,224.35
Consolidated Aircraft Co.				182,500.00	182,500.00
Connecticut Aircraft Co.		33,660.00	6,400.00		40,060.00
Cox Klemm Aircraft Co.			56,500.00	53,800.00	110,300.00
Curtiss Aero & Motor Corporation	733,513.02	1,303,686.67	246,000.00	90,000.00	2,373,199.69
Doyton-Wright Co.	847,005.36	130,757.70	109,837.06	15,800.00	1,103,400.12
Eberhart Steel Products Co.			234,128.74		234,128.74
G. Elias & Bro. (Inc.)	65,600.00		170,000.00		235,600.00
Anthony H. G. Fokker		101,271.93	245,600.00	74,519.00	421,390.93
Gallaudet Aircraft Corporation	239,697.85	383,624.39	88,839.68	86,080.00	803,241.92
Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.	51,500.00	214,048.00	879,351.85	86,511.00	1,231,410.85
Huff-Daland Co.	35,000.00		15,000.00	30,000.00	80,000.00
Italian Government	194,000.00				194,000.00
J. L. Aircraft Co.	100,000.00				100,000.00
L. W. F. Engineering Co.	458,848.12	1,217,852.72	212,000.00	147,757.00	2,036,457.84
Lawrence Sperry Aircraft Co.	139,000.00	77,085.67	187,155.83	53,800.00	457,041.50
Loening Aero Engineering Corporation	92,950.00	136,500.00	215,616.24	133,360.00	578,526.24

Statement of obligations incurred by United States Army Air Service under contracts for airplanes, airships, and balloons, placed with contractors indicated below during the period of July 1, 1919, to June 30, 1923—Continued

Contractor	1920	1921	1922	1923	Total
Glenn L. Martin Co.	\$1,253,982.62		\$12,127.63		\$1,266,110.25
Ordnance Engineering Corporation	228,483.00				228,483.00
Thomas-Morse Aircraft Co.	1,209,243.92	\$48,600.00	167,462.00		1,425,310.92
Wittmann Aircraft Co.	351,000.00		93,975.00	\$86,080.00	531,055.00
United States Navy Department	264,400.00	54,000.00			318,400.00
Total	7,193,471.27	5,904,830.85	4,003,903.88	1,346,464.89	18,448,670.89

Statement showing total appropriation for Army aviation and amount obligated, by fiscal years, for aircraft, engines, accessories, etc., from July 1, 1919, to June 30, 1923

Fiscal year	Appropriation	New aircraft	Engines, instruments, parachutes, combat, photo equipment, etc.	Total
1920	\$25,000,000.00	\$7,193,471.27	\$1,874,465.90	\$9,679,254.62
1921	33,000,000.00	5,904,830.85	4,485,583.32	10,390,414.07
1922	19,200,000.00	4,003,903.88	2,169,666.71	6,173,570.59
1923	12,700,000.00	1,346,464.89	1,679,938.92	3,026,403.81
Total	89,900,000.00	18,448,670.89	10,209,653.95	28,658,324.84
For experimental planes built by engineering division, McCook Field, July 1, 1919, to June 30, 1923				1,103,185.89
Total	89,900,000.00			29,761,510.73

Aircraft ordered by United States Army Air Service

FISCAL YEAR 1920¹

Contract No.	Date	Contractor	Number	Type	Description	Original contract cost	Total obligations to June 30, 1923	Termination date	Remarks
<i>Airplanes</i>									
5682	Aug. 22, 1919	L. W. F. Engineering Corporation	75		Remodeled DH-4 airplanes.	\$74,812.50	\$88,812.50	July 20, 1920	Increase due to changes.
5871	Sept. 30, 1919	do	6		do	8,985.00	8,985.00	Nov. 21, 1919	
5889	Jan. 13, 1920	do	47		do	63,450.00	87,850.00	Oct. 26, 1920	Do.
7023	Feb. 21, 1920	do	13		do	20,605.00	20,605.00	Aug. 3, 1920	
7045	Mar. 25, 1920	do	6		do	8,100.00	8,100.00	Nov. 8, 1920	
7037	Mar. 9, 1920	do	10		Same as above, equipped with twin engine Hall-Scott Liberty 6-cylinder engine.	86,000.00	106,000.00	Jan. 26, 1921	Do.
5642	Aug. 19, 1919	Thomas-Morse Aircraft Co.	75		Remodeled DH-4 airplanes.	74,812.50	86,062.50	Sept. 30, 1920	Do.
5890	Dec. 20, 1919	do	47		do	63,450.00	63,450.00	Nov. 23, 1920	
7020	Feb. 19, 1920	do	41		do	57,031.00	57,031.00	Nov. 11, 1920	
265	May 16, 1920	do	62	I	Single-seater day pursuit planes, including spares.	895,166.00	1,002,705.42	Sept. 17, 1922	Do.
5644	Aug. 21, 1919	Aeromarine Plane & Motor Co.	75		Remodeled DH-4's airplanes.	74,812.50	86,062.50	Apr. 9, 1920	Do.
5892	Nov. 13, 1919	do	47		do	63,450.00	63,450.00	Dec. 6, 1920	
7022	Jan. 12, 1920	do	58		do	79,692.00	79,692.00	Jan. 11, 1921	Do.
5888	Nov. 13, 1919	Boeing Airplane Co.	48		do	64,800.00	65,028.00	June 4, 1920	Do.
7019	Jan. 12, 1920	do	63		do	86,247.00	91,180.50	Dec. 13, 1920	Do.
272	June 15, 1920	do	10	VI	3-seater ground attack planes, including spares.	529,912.13	529,912.13	Sept. 8, 1921	
5887	Nov. 13, 1919	Curtiss A. & M. Corporation	47		Remodeled DH-4's airplanes.	63,450.00	63,450.00	June 17, 1920	
223	Feb. 28, 1920	do	3	II	Single-seater night pursuit planes.	110,000.00	85,536.82	Dec. 2, 1921	One plane canceled.
269	June 16, 1920	do	50	I	Single-seater day pursuit plane, including spares.	579,564.37	584,526.20	Apr. 3, 1922	Increase due to changes.
5886	Nov. 13, 1919	Dayton Wright Airplane Co.	48		Remodeled DH-4 airplanes.	64,800.00	65,796.24	Oct. 25, 1920	Do.
7018	Jan. 12, 1920	do	64		Remodeled DH-4 airplanes, 48 equipped with 300-horsepower Hispano engines.	87,552.00	217,171.93	Nov. 18, 1921	Increase due to changes and installation of engines.
274	June 28, 1920	do	42	X	Corps observation airplanes, including spares.	563,890.10	564,037.19	Jan. 24, 1922	Increase due to changes.
5643	Aug. 21, 1919	Gallaudet Aircraft Corporation	75		Remodeled DH-4 Airplanes.	74,812.50	86,062.50	Sept. 17, 1920	Do.
5891	Dec. 23, 1919	do	47		do	63,450.00	63,450.00	Oct. 18, 1920	
7021	Feb. 20, 1920	do	60		do	82,320.00	82,085.35	Oct. 25, 1920	
7095	June 10, 1920	do	6		do	8,100.00	8,100.00	Nov. 8, 1920	
7101	June 9, 1920	L. W. F. Engr. Corporation	1		Giant bombardment plane "Owl."	138,275.00	138,495.62	Sept. 30, 1920	Do.
7105	June 30, 1920	J. L. Aircraft Corporation	3		Metal monoplanes, 2 engines and spares.	100,000.00	100,000.00	Nov. 4, 1920	
222	Jan. 26, 1920	Ordnance Engr. Corporation	2	VII	2-seater Infantry liaison airplanes.	123,500.00	123,500.00	Apr. 28, 1921	

¹Percentage of increase, 18.7 per cent.

Aircraft ordered by United States Army Air Service—Continued
FISCAL YEAR 1920—continued

Contract		Contractor	Number	Type	Description	Original contract cost	Total obligations to June 30, 1923	Termination date	Remarks
No.	Date								
<i>Airplanes</i>									
252	Apr. 23, 1920	Ordinance Engineering Corporation.	3	I	Single-seater day pursuit planes.	\$97,500.00	\$94,500.00	Mar. 31, 1922	Deduction on account deficiency.
131-D	Feb. 12, 1922	do.			Royalties on 50 Type I planes, built by Curtiss A. & M. Co., on contract 269.	10,488.00	10,488.00	Feb. 1, 1922	
242	Apr. 20, 1920	Lawrence Sperry Aircraft Co.	5	-----	Messenger torpedo airplanes.	139,000.00	139,000.00	Nov. 16, 1922	Covers cost of automatic control.
244	Apr. 10, 1920	Loening Aero Engineering Corporation.	3	I	Single-seater day pursuit planes.	90,000.00	92,950.00	Jan. 31, 1922	Increase due to changes.
279	June 23, 1920	Wittman Aircraft Corporation.	2	XIII	Long-distance night bombardment, including spares.	375,000.00	351,000.00	-----	Awaiting termination; 1 bomber canceled; covers cost of tools, jigs, static tests, spares, and semiproduction drawings.
285	June 4, 1920	Huff-Daland & Co.	3	XIV	2-seater training airplanes.	35,000.00	35,000.00	Dec. 28, 1921	
292	June 28, 1920	G. Elias & Bro.	3	XIV	do.	65,600.00	65,600.00	Aug. 2, 1921	
207	Aug. 26, 1919	Chance Vought Corporation.	1	XV	2-seater training airplanes, including spares.	13,965.00	13,965.00	Apr. 2, 1920	
277	June 9, 1920	Glenn L. Martin Co.	20	XII	Short-distance night bombardment.	1,192,607.81	1,253,982.62	Mar. 5, 1922	Increase due to changes.
Total							6,683,571.27		
<i>Airships</i>									
7050	Apr. 9, 1920	Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.	2	AA	Pony blimps, tractor type.	45,600.00	51,500.00	Feb. 25, 1921	Do.
7103	June 30, 1920	Italian Government.	1	-----	Italian semirigid airship "Roma."	236,000.00	194,000.00	Oct. 17, 1921	
721003	-----	U. S. Navy Department.	3	-----	Coastal airships.	264,400.00	264,400.00	Dec. 30, 1920	
Total						5,876,200.41	509,900.00		
Total, fiscal year 1920.							7,193,471.27		

FISCAL YEAR 1921

<i>Airplanes</i>									
354	Mar. 15, 1921	Aeromarine Plane & Motor Corporation.	3	IV	Single seater armored pursuit planes.	\$99,000.00	\$99,000.00	Dec. 29, 1922	Increase account additional repairs.
327	Nov. 18, 1920	do.	60		Remodeled D. H-4 planes.	84,000.00	84,150.00	Oct. 20, 1921	
	Sept. 2, 1920	B. A. T. Co., through M. A. London, England.	1		Bantam airplane, 1 Wasp engine, 2 sets spares.	9,600.00	9,600.00	Dec. 16, 1920	Awaiting termination 1; plane canceled.
346	Dec. 20, 1920	Boeing Airplane Co.	3	VI	3-seater ground attack planes.	239,450.00	178,500.00		
385	Apr. 8, 1921	do.	200	I	Single-seater day pursuit planes, including spares.	1,583,741.12	1,657,985.47	June 19, 1923	Increase due to changes and to provide for overseas shipment.
400	June 29, 1921	Chance Vought Co.	7	XV	2-seater training planes, including spares.	84,966.00	84,966.00	Dec. 1, 1921	
321	Nov. 9, 1920	Curtiss A. & M. Corporation.	3		Curtiss Eagle planes.	75,000.00	75,000.00	Nov. 9, 1921	Awaiting termination; increase due to changes and to provide for superchargers.
402	June 29, 1921	do.	60	XII	Short distance night bombers and spares.	1,167,740.00	1,228,686.67		
407	June 30, 1921	Dayton-Wright Co.	3	XIV	2-seater training planes.	42,500.00	42,500.00	Dec. 7, 1922	Awaiting termination.
408	June 29, 1921	do.	3		Alert airplanes (air cooled).	90,000.00	88,257.70		
	Oct. 18, 1920	A. H. G. Fokker, through M. A., The Hague.	2		Monoplanes, Fokker D type.	5,271.93	5,271.93	June 15, 1921	One (1) canceled.
344	Dec. 4, 1920	Anthony H. G. Fokker.	2		Fokker transport airplanes.	60,000.00	60,000.00	June 30, 1922	
344	do.	do.	2		Single-seater armored combat airplanes.	36,000.00	36,000.00	do.	Increase on account of additional repairs.
348	Dec. 24, 1920	Gallandet Aircraft Corporation.	3	XI	Day bombardment planes.	375,000.00	253,000.00	July 23, 1922	
327	Nov. 18, 1920	do.	60		Remodeled DH-4 planes.	84,000.00	84,624.39	Oct. 31, 1921	Two (2) canceled.
405	June 29, 1921	do.	3	I	Single-seat day pursuit planes.	119,000.00	51,000.00	Nov. 17, 1922	
325	Nov. 18, 1920	L. W. F. Engineering Corporation.	150		Remodeled DH-4 airplanes.	210,000.00	211,790.84	June 29, 1921	Awaiting termination, increase due to changes and provide for overseas shipment.
367	May 5, 1921	do.	35	XII	Short distance night bombers, and spares.	948,631.95	1,006,061.88		
379	June 18, 1921	Lawrence Sperry Aircraft Co.	6		Messenger planes.	25,500.00	44,500.00	Apr. 29, 1922	Covers cost of automatic control.
404	June 29, 1921	do.	6		do.	24,000.00	32,585.67		Awaiting termination, increase on account changes.
357	Jan. 20, 1921	Loening Aero Engineering Corporation.	3	III	Single-seater day pursuit planes.	110,000.00	87,500.00	June 7, 1923	
406	June 30, 1921	do.	2	I	do.	49,000.00	49,000.00	Apr. 27, 1922	One (1) canceled.
370	May 24, 1921	Thomas-Morse Aircraft Corporation.	3		Racing airplanes.	48,600.00	48,600.00	Dec. 22, 1921	
		U. S. Navy Department	1		All metal single-seater pursuit plane, "Dornier Type D-1."	9,000.00	9,000.00	Dec. 20, 1922	
Total							5,527,580.55		
<i>Airships</i>									
7228	Apr. 21, 1921	Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.	2		Pony blimps, 35,000 cubic feet and spares.	46,655.00	47,048.00	Apr. 18, 1922	Increase due to changes.
7247	June 17, 1921	do.	1		Military airship, 180,000 cubic feet.	147,000.00	147,000.00	June 30, 1922	
7297	June 30, 1921	Airships Manufacturing Co.	1		Twin engine, nonrigid-airship type U. S. M. B.	34,896.74	34,736.94	Dec. 30, 1922	
	Apr. 11, 1921	U. S. Navy Department	1		Single engine towing airship.	45,000.00	45,000.00	July 27, 1922	
Total							278,784.94		

* Percentage of decrease, nine-tenths of 1 per cent.

Aircraft ordered by United States Army Air Service—Continued
FISCAL YEAR 1921—continued

Contract		Contractor	Number	Type	Description	Original contract cost	Total obligations to June 30, 1923	Termination date	Remarks
No.	Date								
Balloons									
7153	July 30, 1920	Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.	1		Spherical free balloons, 80,000 cubic feet capacity, racing type.	\$8,000.00	\$8,000.00	Dec. 30, 1920	
7181	Oct. 12, 1920	do	10		Supply balloons, 5,000 cubic feet.	12,000.00	12,000.00	Mar. 10, 1921	
7156	July 30, 1920	Connecticut Aircraft Co.	1		Spherical free balloon, 80,000 cubic feet capacity, racing type.	4,000.00	4,000.00	Oct. 30, 1920	
7263	June 15, 1921	do	4		Observation balloons, 37,500 cubic feet, type A. P.	27,000.00	26,000.00	Oct. 12, 1922	
	June 10, 1921	do	4		Supply balloons, 5,000 cubic feet.	3,560.00	3,660.00	Mar. 10, 1922	Increase due to changes.
7262	June 24, 1921	Airships Manufacturing Co.	20		do	17,960.00	17,960.00	Nov. 2, 1921	
7212	Feb. 8, 1921	do	8		Spherical free balloons, 35,000 cubic feet.	31,845.36	31,845.36	Aug. 15, 1921	
Total						5,957,918.10	103,465.36		
Total for fiscal year 1921.							5,904,830.85		
FISCAL YEAR 1922 ¹									
Airplanes									
7341	Feb. 27, 1922	Aeromarine P. & M. Corporation.	25	XII	Bombardment planes and spares.	\$560,492.00	\$601,709.41		In operation; increase due to changes; 19 planes to be delivered.
7389	June 16, 1922	Boeing Airplane Co.	50		Remodeled DH-4 planes.	98,157.92	92,645.70		Ready for shipment; increase due to changes.
7398	June 28, 1922	Chance Vought Corporation.	27	XV	Training planes VE-9 and spares.	277,293.35	277,293.35		In operation.
524	Dec. 3, 1921	Cox-Klemin Aircraft Corporation.	3	XV	2-seater training planes.	54,000.00	56,500.00	May 31, 1923	Do.
556	June 17, 1922	Curtiss A. & M. Corporation.	2	XII	Short-distance night bombers.	170,000.00	170,000.00		Do.
552	May 27, 1922	do	2		Racing planes and spares.	76,000.00	76,000.00	Nov. 6, 1922	
7396	June 9, 1922	Aeromarine P. & M. Corporation.	50		Remodeled DH-4 planes.	89,754.00	92,261.39	May 1, 1923	Increase due to changes.
7403	June 20, 1922	Dayton-Wright Co.	10	XIV	Primary training planes, TA-3 and spares.	78,460.00	81,398.00	May 29, 1923	Do.
7471	June 30, 1922	do	2	XV	Training planes T. W. 3's.	22,500.00	28,439.06	do	Do.
7384	June 21, 1922	Eberhardt Steel Products Co.	50	L	Single-seater pursuit, including bomb rack releases and spares.	166,110.00	234,128.74		In operation; 36 to be delivered; contract practically complete; increase due to providing parachute seats.
554	June 17, 1922	G. Elias & Bro. (Inc.)	2	XII	Short-distance night bombers.	170,000.00	170,000.00		In operation.
42119	June 30, 1922	Anthony H. G. Fokker	1	I	Single-seat day pursuit plane.	10,000.00	10,000.00	July 11, 1922	
42120	do	do	1	XV	2-seater training planes.	5,000.00	5,000.00	do	
548	May 29, 1922	do	3	X	Corps observation planes.	100,000.00	100,000.00		Awaiting termination; delivery made.
549	May 27, 1922	do	10	I	Single-seater day pursuit planes, including spares.	130,600.00	130,600.00		Awaiting termination; delivery made; 2 planes canceled.
559	June 22, 1922	Gallaudet Aircraft Corporation.	3	X	Corps observation planes.	110,000.00	88,839.68	June 16, 1923	
536	Jan. 17, 1922	Huff Daland & Co.			Remodeling 2 training planes.	15,000.00	15,000.00	Dec. 30, 1922	
555	June 17, 1922	L. W. F. Engineering Corporation.	2	XII	Short-distance night bombers.	170,000.00	170,000.00		In operation.
7388	May 23, 1922	Lawrence Sperry Aircraft Co.	3		Special type speed planes.	75,000.00	98,189.65	Nov. 23, 1922	Increase due to changes.
7390	May 29, 1922	do	20		Messenger planes, air-cooled engine and spares.	86,664.62	88,966.18	May 25, 1923	Do.
7364	Apr. 17, 1922	Loening Aero Engineering Corporation.	10	I	Monoplanes, pursuit type, P. W. 2's, and spares.	146,500.00	147,116.24	Mar. 16, 1923	Do.
550	May 27, 1922	do	2		Racing planes.	76,000.00	68,500.00	Oct. 31, 1922	Deduction account performance.
560	June 17, 1922	Glenn L. Martin Co.	3	XIII	Long-distance night bomber.	332,000.00	12,127.63		Awaiting cancellation of contract.
551	June 5, 1922	Thomas-Morse Aircraft Co.	2		Racing planes.	81,000.00	76,000.00	Nov. 13, 1922	Deduction made account performance.
7397	June 13, 1920	do	50		Remodeled DH-4' planes.	90,202.00	91,462.00		In operation, 40; planes delivered; balance of 10 to be delivered.
7392	June 26, 1922	Wittelman Aircraft Co.	50		Remodeled DH-4 planes.	87,500.00	93,975.00		In operation. Practically complete; awaiting shipment; increase due to changes and packing.
7312	Nov. 2, 1921	L. W. F. Engineering Corporation.			Repair and reconditioning of giant bomber "Owl."	27,000.00	27,000.00	July 1, 1922	
7312-A	Apr. 5, 1922	do			Further repairs made to above.	15,000.00	15,000.00	do	
Total							3,118,152.03		
Airships									
7413	June 26, 1922	Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.	3	C	Airships, improved type.	213,500.00	256,008.00		In operation 2 ships delivered, 1 to be delivered, increase due to changes.
7424	June 29, 1922	do	2	A	Airships, improved type and spares.	139,504.70	144,993.85		In operation 2 to be delivered; increase due to changes.
562	June 20, 1922	do	1		Semirigid, long range reconnaissance airship and constructed around 4-300 H. P. model 12-a Liberty engines.	475,000.00	475,000.00		In operation.

¹ Percentage of decrease, 3 1/8 per cent.

Aircraft ordered by United States Army Air Service—Continued
FISCAL YEAR 1922—continued

Contract		Contractor	Number	Type	Description	Original contract cost	Total obligations to June 30, 1923	Termination date	Remarks
No.	Date								
41771	June 20, 1922	Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.	1		<i>Airships—Continued</i> High altitude spherical balloon.	\$3,350.00	* \$3,350.00	Nov. 30, 1922	
		Total.....					876,001.85		
39641	Jan. 26, 1922	Connecticut Aircraft Co.	1		<i>Balloons</i> High altitude observation type balloon.	6,400.00	6,400.00	Nov. 23, 1922	
		Total.....					9,750.00		
		Total for fiscal year 1922.....					4,003,903.88		
		Total original contract cost.....				4,157,988.59			
FISCAL YEAR 1923 ¹									
7519	June 9, 1923	Boeing Airplane Co.	50		<i>Airplanes</i> Repair and remodel DH-4 into DH-4B's with steel fuselage.	\$157,500.00	\$157,500.00		In operation.
7515	June 14, 1923	Consolidated Aircraft Co.	20	XV	Training planes, T. W. 3's and spares.	182,500.00	182,500.00		In operation, to be completed Jan. 15, 1924.
7499	Feb. 28, 1923	Cox-Klemin A. C. Corporation.	25		Remodeled DH-4 planes.	53,800.00	53,800.00		In operation.
640	Apr. 27, 1923	Curtis A. & M. Corporation.	3	I	Single seater day pursuit planes.	90,000.00	90,000.00		In operation; 1 delivered.
613	Sept. 30, 1922	Dayton-Wright Co.	1	XIV	2-seater training planes.	15,800.00	15,800.00		Awaiting termination.
625	Feb. 28, 1923	Boeing Airplane Co.	3		Redesigned DH-4 airplanes.	15,000.00	15,163.89		Awaiting termination; increase due to changes.
610	Aug. 15, 1922	Anthony H. G. Fokker	5	X	Corps observation planes and spares.	74,519.00	74,519.00		In operation; includes cost of static-test model.
7498	Feb. 28, 1923	Gallaudet Aircraft Corporation.	40		Remodeled DH-4's.	68,080.00	66,080.00		In operation.
615	Oct. 12, 1922	Huff Daland & Co.	1	XIV	2-seater training plane, and spares.	30,000.00	30,000.00	May 21, 1923	
623	Mar. 10, 1923	L. W. F. Engineering Corporation.	10		Transport airplanes and spares.	147,757.00	147,757.00		Do.
7501	Feb. 28, 1923	Lawrence Sperry Aircraft Co.	25		Remodeled DH-4's.	53,800.00	53,800.00		Do.
7476	Aug. 24, 1922	Loening Aero Engineering Corporation.	8		Sea planes, Model 23, with 3 sets spares.	133,460.00	133,460.00		In operation; 6 delivered; to be delivered, 2.
7489	Oct. 21, 1922	Witteham Aircraft Co.	40		Remodeled DH-4's.	86,080.00	86,080.00		
7500	Feb. 28, 1923				Total.....		1,126,459.89		
611	Oct. 31, 1922	Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.			<i>Airships</i> 3 transmissions for semi-rigid long range reconnaissance type airship; under contract 562.	67,350.00	67,350.00		In operation.
7521	June 19, 1923	Airships (Inc.) (Airship Mfg. Co.).	3	C	Airships, improved type, 200,000 cubic feet capacity.	133,494.00	133,494.00		Do.
		Total.....					200,844.00		
7504	Mar. 13, 1923	Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.	4		<i>Balloons</i> Spherical balloons, 35,000 cubic feet capacity.	19,161.00	19,161.00		Do.
		Total.....					19,161.00		
		Total for fiscal year 1923.....					1,346,464.89		
		Total original contract cost.....				1,346,301.00			

¹ To be included under balloons.² Percentage of increase, nil.

From the Navy I obtained like information which I placed in the RECORD, with the exception of inclosures B, G, and H, which the Navy Department claims to be confidential and which, of course, I will not include. I am returning these inclosures to the Navy Department in accordance with their request. I want to assure the membership of this House, however, that there was really nothing of a very confidential nature contained in these inclosures. Information concerning the type, number of planes, which has already been testified before committees of the House, and the size and dimensions of these planes are so universally known by engineers and those of us interested in aviation, that I really could not understand the extraordinary precaution taken by the department. However, in compliance with its wishes, I shall not include the information and am returning it, as I just stated.

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, January 31, 1924.

Subject: Data on Naval Aviation.
Inclosures—

(A) Appropriations for Naval Aviation since July 1, 1919.

(B) Six charts giving characteristics, weights, and performances of naval aircraft (3 sheets).

(C) Amount of each year's appropriation allotted for purchase of aircraft.

(D) Companies which have built aircraft for the United States Navy.

(E) Payments made to aircraft companies since January 1, 1919.

(F) Type, number, and unit cost of aircraft built at naval aircraft factory since 1919.

(G) Aircraft under construction on November 1, 1923.

(H) Serviceable aircraft as of November 1, 1923.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Referring to your letter of January 23, 1924, there are forwarded herewith eight inclosures containing data prepared by the Bureau of Aeronautics relative to aircraft, as requested by you.

Some of the data contained in these inclosures is considered confidential, some of it is "for official use only," and much of it should be treated as confidential. This applies particularly to inclosures (B), (G), and (H). It is requested that inclosures (B) and (H),

be returned to this office as soon as they have served their purpose. You will note that these inclosures have been prepared as of November 1, 1923, in order to have this data available for congressional hearings, this data corresponding to the date that most of the data is carried forward in preparation for congressional hearings.

Sincerely yours,

EDWIN DENBY.

Hon. F. H. LaGuardia,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Appropriations for naval aviation since July 1, 1919

Year	Appropriated	Unobligated
1919-20	\$25,000,000	\$3,129,434
1920-21	20,000,000	2,500,709
1921-22	13,413,431	3,631,178
1922-23	14,683,950	27,107
1923-24	14,647,174	

DISPOSITION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES

1919-20. Transferred to 1922 appropriation.	
1920-21. Transferred to 1922 appropriation.	
1921-22. Reverted to Treasury.	
1922-23. Will revert to Treasury June 30, 1925.	
1923-24. Will revert to Treasury June 30, 1926.	
Amount of each year's appropriation allotted for purchase of aircraft	
1919-20	\$3,127,250
1920-21	3,883,400
1921-22	5,323,000
1922-23	6,537,000
1923-24	5,798,950

[NOTE.—This does not include lighter-than-air craft.]

Companies which have built aircraft for the United States Navy since July 1, 1919

Company	Quantity	Model	Unit price	Date of order	Date of delivery of last plane
Aerial Engineering Corp.	2	BR-1	\$24,125	May 13, 1922	Feb. 6, 1923
Aeromarine Plane & Motor Co.	1 (50) 8	40	9,300	Sept. 9, 1918	July 18, 1919
Do.	3	AS	20,736	June 30, 1921	Sept. 20, 1922
Cox-Klemin Aircraft Corp.	6	XS-1	6,717	June 13, 1922	Only two delivered.
Curtiss Aeroplane & Motor Corp.	1 (70) 3	MF boats	8,000	July 13, 1918	Aug. 15, 1919
Do.	1 (4) 3	HS-3	13,500	Nov. 19, 1918	Aug. 29, 1919
Do.	1	CT	75,000	June 30, 1920	May 1, 1921
Do.	2	OR	47,600	June 30, 1921	Oct. 5, 1922
Do.	23	TS	11,679	do	Feb. 21, 1923
Do.	11	do	9,850	Sept. 13, 1921	June 30, 1923
Davis-Douglas Co. (now the Douglas Co.)	3	DT	33,333	Apr. 14, 1921	Aug. 22, 1922
Do.	18	DT-2	21,815	Apr. 10, 1922	Apr. 30, 1923
Do.	20	do	15,154	Nov. 3, 1922	Oct. —, 1923
Dayton-Wright Co.	1	WA	37,300	June 3, 1921	Dec. 31, 1922
Do.	1	WS	30,300	do	Do.
Do.	11	DT-2	22,765	Sept. 23, 1922	May 26, 1923
Do.	1	TW-3	15,900	June 27, 1923	Aug. 13, 1923

Numbers in parentheses indicate total number included in the contract.

Companies which have built aircraft for the United States Navy since July 1, 1919—Con.

Company	Quantity	Model	Unit price	Date of order	Date of delivery of last plane
G. Elias & Bro.	1	EM-1	\$17,000	June 29, 1920	June —, 1922
Do.	6	EM-2	23,683	Sept. 22, 1921	Sept. 22, 1921
Huff-Daland & Co.	3	HN-1	16,000	Feb. 6, 1922	Nov. 14, 1922
Do.	3	HO-1	14,600	Nov. 13, 1922	Apr. 6, 1923
Do.	3	HN-2	13,667	June 5, 1922	Oct. —, 1923
Loening Aeronautical Engineering Corp.	1	LS	14,000	May 15, 1919	Oct. —, 1919
Do.	1	M-8	15,597	June 30, 1919	Aug. 9, 1919
Do.	10	M-80	12,950	do	May 15, 1920
Do.	6	M-81-S	14,520	Apr. 29, 1920	Jan. 3, 1921
Loughhead Aircraft Corp.	2	HS-2	24,366	June 20, 1918	May 1, 1919
L-W-F Engineering Co.	20	DT-2	17,000	Nov. 16, 1922	Oct. —, 1923
Glenn L. Martin Co.	2	Martin bomber	42,000	Dec. 24, 1919	Jan. 23, 1920
Do.	8	Martin torpedo	51,000	do	Aug. 6, 1920
Do.	3	M20-1	25,658	Apr. 10, 1922	Apr. —, 1923
Do.	6	MO-1	35,417	Apr. 25, 1922	Apr. 18, 1923
Do.	6	MS-1	7,238	June 12, 1922	July 30, 1923
Do.	80	MO-1	26,072	Feb. 13, 1923	Two delivered.
Jas. V. Martin	3	K-4	15,750	June 30, 1920	Feb. 17, 1922
Lawrence Sperry Aircraft Corp.	1	Sperry bomber	103,485	Sept. 25, 1918	Nov. 14, 1919
Thomas-Morse Aircraft Co.	11	MB-3			
Do.	1	MB-7	22,000	May 16, 1922	Feb. 1, 1922
Lewis & Vought Corp.	20	VE-7	11,020	Oct. 10, 1919	Mar. 3, 1921
Do.	40	VE-7-SF	12,300	Oct. 17, 1920	June 20, 1921
Do.	21	VE-9	8,616	June 24, 1922	July 10, 1923
Do.	6	UO-1	12,651	June 30, 1922	Aug. 23, 1923
Do.	13	UO-1	11,807	Feb. 15, 1923	(?)
Do.	2	NW	30,000	Sept. 15, 1922	Dec. 30, 1922
Wright Aeronautical Corp.	2	XB-1A	18,500	Jan. —, 1920	Dec. —, 1921
Wright-Martin Aircraft Corp.	2	Blackburn	\$32,800	May 12, 1921	Mar. —, 1922
Blackburn Aeroplane Co.	2	Heinkel-Caspar	\$20,750	Jan. 1, 1922	Sept. 8, 1922
Casper Werke	2	JL-6	27,100	Aug. 7, 1920	Sept. 4, 1920
J. L. Aircraft Corp.	3	Macchi	1,615	Dec. —, 1920	July —, 1921
Macchi Co.	3	Morane Saulnier	4,567	Mar. 1, 1921	July 28, 1921
Morane Saulnier	6	Parnall Panther	\$12,230	Feb. —, 1920	May 28, 1920
Geo. Parnall & Son	2	Fokker C-1	\$4,000	Sept. —, 1920	Dec. 3, 1920
Netherlands Aircraft Manufacturing Co.	3	Fokker FT	\$32,833	Feb. 16, 1921	Apr. 19, 1923
Do.	1	Dornier CS-1	\$15,000	May —, 1921	Aug. 4, 1921
Van Berkel, Holland	1	Dornier D-1	\$9,000	Jan. —, 1921	Feb. —, 1922
Vickers (Ltd.)	1	Viking IV	\$31,950	June 27, 1921	June 26, 1922

* Includes cancellation charge for 3 additional planes originally ordered.

† Through U. S. Army Air Service.

‡ Now Chance Vought Corp.

§ Through U. S. Army Air Service.

¶ Two delivered.

‡ With engine.

§ Societa Anonyma Nieuport Macchi.

¶ Approximately, with engine.

Payments made to aircraft companies since January 1, 1919

Company	1919	1920	1921	1922	1923	Total
Aerial Engineering Corporation				\$70,426.09	\$5,100.00	\$81,526.09
Aeromarine Plane & Motor Corporation	\$62,389.84		\$77,092.91	151,507.25	180,952.84	471,942.84
Cox Klemin Aircraft Corporation				5,000.00	33,324.48	38,324.48
Curtiss Aeroplane & Motor Corporation	2,581,657.13	\$66,009.73	203,623.05	243,764.40	1,961,832.56	5,066,886.87
Davis Douglas Co. (The Douglas Co.)			57,186.85	200,087.45	687,822.28	944,096.59
Dayton Wright Co.			10,000.00	6,000.00	383,873.78	405,873.78
G. Elias & Bros.			39,327.67	126,296.94	2,439.71	168,064.32
Huff Daland & Co.			2,000.00	58,300.00	104,956.24	165,256.24
Loening Aeronautical Engineering Corporation	52,283.26	188,798.03	21,040.00			262,121.29
Loughhead Aircraft Corporation	48,733.58					48,733.58
L-W-F Engineering Corporation	111,011.72	2,477.47	2,460.00		372,669.03	488,618.22
Glenn L. Martin Co.	350.00	640,227.37	825.00	128,113.00	360,916.21	1,130,131.58
James V. Martin (Martin Aero. Factory)	1,332.90	509.00	43,594.99			45,437.89
Lawrence Sperry Aircraft Corporation	63,164.00	41,985.47				105,149.47
Lewis & Vought Corporation (Chance Vought)		224,990.00	569,786.80	129,394.66	219,650.18	1,143,771.64
Wright Aeronautical Corporation		946,867.50	906,722.24	527,537.60	1,651,941.41	4,082,568.75

Gentlemen, this House appointed a special committee to look into the subject of aviation generally and certain features of patents covering flying machines particularly. I understand the committee is going into this subject very thoroughly and will soon report its findings to the House. If they are going into the subject thoroughly, I am convinced that the committee, too, will realize that we must change our policy, unite our efforts, and get more for our money. Many Members of this

House who have given this subject study I am sure will agree with me that we must not continue longer than the present fiscal year under the present haphazard, unscientific, wasteful manner. I presented the figures, which may seem tiresome and tedious, but I wanted to have them together for the purpose of reference, as this subject will come before us from time to time. Let us to-day take the first step by refusing the appropriation requested for the new Dayton field, without prejudicing that

project, and when the time comes that we adopt the policy and a comprehensive plan the Dayton project will receive its day in court and be decided on the merits. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute. On page 3, line 4, strike out the words "permitted by the classification act of 1923."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 3, line 4, strike out the words "permitted by the classification act of 1923."

Mr. BLANTON. Gentlemen, attention has already been called to the manner in which the salaries of employees are raised from a lower to a higher grade under the classification act. This Personnel Board is made up of assistant chiefs, and they immediately raise the salaries of their chiefs, knowing, of course, that raises of their salaries in turn will be taken care of.

I want to show you just exactly how it operates on individuals. I am going to name them, and I am going to give you the salaries. You take, for instance, the action of the Personnel Board with respect to the General Land Office in the Interior Department. Here is the commissioner, William Spry. His old salary was \$5,000, and he now gets \$6,000. The assistant commissioner, George Wickam. His old salary was \$3,500, and he now gets \$5,200. The chief attorney, John McFall. His old salary was \$2,500, and he now gets \$5,200, or more than twice his old salary. You take assistant attorney D. K. Parrot. His old salary was \$2,200, and he has been classified up to \$5,200, over double the amount of the salary he was drawing. Take the second assistant attorney, S. V. Proudft. His old salary was \$2,200, and he now gets \$5,200. You take C. S. Oberchain. His old salary was \$2,200, and he now gets \$4,500. I challenge the Committee on Appropriations, or any member of it, to show that his position is needed down there—Mr. Oberchain's position. There are six chiefs of division. The former salary was \$2,000, and they now get \$3,200, a \$1,200 raise. There are four chiefs of division whose former salary was \$2,000, and they now get \$3,000, a \$1,000 raise. There were six favored pets down there who formerly drew from \$1,800 to \$2,000. They have been raised to \$2,700. There were four favored pets down there who drew \$1,800, and they were raised to \$2,200. But when you get down to the lower clerks you will see where the money has come from. The ones less favored and who have not been the pets have suffered in consequence.

You 35 men on the Appropriations Committee are going to have to look into that proposition. You have got to do something more than make the little change of verbiage you put into this paragraph of the bill and in other bills. You must stop it, but you can not stop it by merely changing this paragraph in this manner.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. As I understand it, none of the cases to which the gentleman has called the attention of the House are covered by this bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I could call the gentleman's attention to some cases in this bill.

Mr. ANTHONY. We should be very glad to have you do so.

Mr. BLANTON. I have not the figures here at this time, but I did have these others. The gentleman will find that this is illustrative of almost every one of the bureaus in the 10 departments of the Government if he will investigate it. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee has found it out; he knows the facts in the case, because he has investigated it to a certain extent. It ought to stop. The first thing this Congress ought to do is to repeal that classification act. We are going to be helpless as to raises in salaries if we let it go on any further. We should not permit this lump-sum appropriation practice to continue and permit men to raise their own salaries at will through the appointment of subchiefs, whose action is known before they act. It is ridiculously absurd for us to let that law remain on the statute books longer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, that was a pro forma amendment, and I withdraw it.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

FINANCE DEPARTMENT
PAY, ETC., OF THE ARMY

Pay of officers: For pay of officers of the line and staff, \$29,809,300.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUDSPETH: Page 9, line 13, after the word "staff," strike out "\$29,809,300" and add "\$29,870,100; provided that \$60,800 of this sum shall be used for the pay of 25 additional chaplains in the Regular Army."

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that my genial friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON], should even reserve a point of order on this amendment. I would have thought he would readily accept this amendment. His ministerial bearing and his general character upon this floor would indicate to me he would accept an amendment adding 25 chaplains to the Regular Army.

I want to call the gentleman's attention to the hearings upon a bill that is now pending before the Committees on Military of the House and Senate, known as Senate bill 2532 and House bill 7038, in which the War Department through the Secretary of War asks for 25 additional chaplains, and I will refer the gentleman from Iowa, who has made the point of order upon my amendment, to the testimony taken at that hearing.

It seems that Colonel Pierson, representing the War Department, and in fact I believe the special representative of the Secretary of War, appeared at a joint hearing on this bill introduced in the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Kansas, Senator CAPPER, and in the House by the able Representative from Iowa [Mr. HULL], the gentleman's colleague.

Colonel Pierson made a statement with regard to this bill at the hearing, asking for 25 additional chaplains. The Secretary of War had recommended the legislation, and this was his special representative speaking at the hearing on the bill which the gentleman's colleague had introduced.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDSPETH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. If we could confine their services and attention to the officers, I would be in favor of increasing the number by 100 additional chaplains.

Mr. HUDSPETH. To the officers of the Army?

Mr. BLANTON. To the officers of the Army; yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. We are going to confine it both to the officers and to the privates, so Colonel Pierson states, and he tells why this is needed.

Colonel Pierson states that he appears at the hearing as a special representative of the Secretary of War, and furthermore he says that the Secretary of War approves this measure. I want to state to the gentleman from Iowa, who has made the point of order, that his colleague asked Colonel Pierson this question:

Mr. HULL. As a matter of fact, I think it is true that you have some units with over 1,000 men that have no chaplain?

Colonel Pierson states:

I have not the data, but Colonel Axton can answer the question.

Colonel Axton is the chief of chaplains in the Regular Army, and he answered that that was true.

We are a God-fearing and a God-loving people down on the Rio Grande, and we have detachments of troops scattered up and down the portion of the border which I represent of 890 miles, and we have units of 1,000 men without any chaplains to-day. I want to ask my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, is the gentleman going to make a point of order against an amendment which seeks to carry out the very purpose and the specific request of the War Department of his administration through its Secretary of War. That is what this amendment does. It simply increases the appropriation by \$60,000 for the pay of these additional chaplains.

Then Mr. HULL asked the further question:

Mr. HULL. That comes about, as I understand it [the reduction in chaplains], because of the reduced condition of the enlisted personnel. We have provided for an army of 280,000, but we have reduced it to

125,000, and, of course, we have not the chaplains to distribute to these detached units.

I want to state to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, that they reduced the personnel, but they reduced the number of chaplains twice as much as they reduced the personnel of the Army.

Mr. BLANTON. And they increased the number of officers?

Mr. HUDSPETH. That is what he states here, two-sevenths more than they reduced the chaplains.

Mr. BLANTON. When it is the officers who need the chaplains?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Yes; and likewise the men under them.

Mr. ROSENBLOOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. ROSENBLOOM. They do not need in time of peace the number of chaplains they require in times of war.

Mr. HUDSPETH. The representative of the War Department says they need at present peace times 25 additional chaplains. I am simply quoting the representative of the War Department.

Mr. ROSENBLOOM. I do not understand that.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I am quoting the representative of the department down here.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. In time of war we do not win battles with chaplains, but win battles with officers and men.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I want to say to my friend the gentleman from New York that this representative of the War Department says that the work of the chaplain encourages the officers and men to fight through the moral and spiritual influence that a good chaplain usually exerts.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I am glad I have convinced my friend the gentleman from New York, and I will not direct my remarks to him, but will continue to direct them to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON].

At this hearing Mr. HULL asked this question:

Mr. HULL. What is your opinion as to having an organization of 800 or 900 or 1,000 young boys together without having any spiritual advisers?

Colonel PIERSON. I believe such a condition or situation is the same in a civil community as in a military community.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HUDSPETH. May I have two minutes more, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I want to state to my friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] that while I am not affiliated with any church, I believe very strongly in the Christian religion, and I am pretty strong for preachers, except the political preacher. I am strong for the old-fashioned preacher who reads his text from the Bible and stays with it. I do want to state that, according to the testimony of your representative who appeared for the War Department, and also according to the statement of the chief of chaplains—a very distinguished gentleman and a very able and a good man, Colonel Axton—the gentleman certainly would not stand up here in the face of that testimony and make a point of order on an amendment asked by the Secretary of War and advocated by these two gentlemen.

Mr. HULL asked Colonel Pierson if he did not think a chaplain was necessary for these isolated units of 1,000 men, and Colonel Pierson said "Yes"; because where they are left to themselves they are apt to come in contact with demoralizing influences unless there is some means provided for the necessary advice, counsel, and direction of the soldiers' activities and for the wholesome use of their leisure time. Unless there is that thing provided, they are very apt to spend time in undesirable ways.

There are many of these units scattered throughout this country, and this amendment simply seeks to carry out the purposes of a bill now pending which has the unqualified indorsement of the Secretary of War, as shown by the statement of his special representative before the committee—Colonel Pierson. If my friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] desires to make a point of order upon an amendment of this character, Mr. Chairman, I shall have to concede that it is probably subject to a point of order; but the point should be withdrawn and my amendment adopted.

Mr. McKENZIE. Did the gentleman from Iowa reserve his point of order?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I reserved a point of order.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I regret very much that I have to differ with my good friend from Texas on the legislation proposed. The fact of the matter is that I oppose granting commissions to chaplains in the Army. I do not think there is any sound military reason to be given why chaplains in the Army should not be called preachers or ministers the same as they are out of the Army. The matter of granting commissions to chaplains in the Army is a mistake, in my judgment, and furthermore this bill that my good friend from Texas has in his hand not only proposes to increase the number of chaplains which now grants a chaplain for each 1,000 men, but it provides for an increase of grade and rank and pay of these men, and also to give each one of them an aid, and so increases the expense of the Military Establishment by thousands and thousands of dollars.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Certainly.

Mr. HUDSPETH. My amendment only provides for increasing the number by 25 over the present number with the present pay.

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes; but the bill to which the gentleman alluded and on which hearings were held before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs provides for an increase of rank and pay and for the aids.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. In making the statement which the gentleman just made, does he realize that preachers outside of the Army have no access to men in the Army should the commanding officer so ordain? They are not permitted to even preach to them in some places. I happen to know that down in the district of my colleague, Mr. WURZBACH, in the city of San Antonio, Tex., a Baptist minister once sought to administer spiritual advice to the men there in the Army and the officer in charge prohibited him from doing so. If outside preachers can not do it, ought not there to be enough chaplains in the Army who have authority to do it?

Mr. McKENZIE. I must say to the gentleman from Texas that I am surprised to know that there is any such locality in the United States as the one he now speaks of.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, that incident is well known to the people of Texas, and my colleague will doubtless remember when that occurred.

Mr. WURZBACH. Let me say that I have no knowledge of it and never heard of it until the gentleman just spoke of it.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, the gentleman did not then live in San Antonio, but I thought he kept better posted as to what happened in his district than that. I am going to ask permission to put the names in the RECORD of the preacher and the general who denied him the right to preach to the men, and as soon as I can send to my office for the data I will place same in the RECORD at this juncture.

Mr. McKENZIE. I know that in every city in this country and every community of this country you can see the spires of the churches pointing toward the sky. There is no place in this country where a man can not attend church if he feels so disposed. There is no better place for a soldier to attend church than at the various posts where they are stationed. My objection to this, however, is that we have a sufficient number of chaplains in the Army to-day to correspond to the enlisted personnel of 125,000 men. Furthermore, bear this in mind, that the policy of the War Department—and it ought to be the policy of Congress—is to see that the Military Establishment of our country is concentrated more than it is to-day, so that we will not have these little scattered posts with a company or two or a battalion, but will have posts with a regiment or more, and then we will have plenty of chaplains. Furthermore, the Army of the United States may be further reduced. I hope it will not be, but why at this time attempt to increase the number of chaplains? A few years ago by legislation offered by the gentleman from Kansas we cut down the number of Infantry officers, the number of Cavalry officers, the number of Artillery officers; and while I believe in having preaching in the Army, I say the Military Establishment should be maintained as a fighting organization above all things, and we need officers of the line more than we need chaplains or doctors commissioned in the Army.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. During the honorable career of the gentleman, how many positions has he succeeded in abolishing? I have tried it in the Navy and have not made a start yet.

Mr. McKENZIE. We have abolished a few and have been working very hard to abolish others. I want to say to my good friend from Pennsylvania that if he will keep on fighting he can reduce some of the expenses in the Navy.

Mr. BUTLER. How long will it take and how old will I be?

Mr. McKENZIE. Oh, the gentleman will be here for 20 or 30 years more, I hope. [Laughter.]

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the number of chaplains in the organization is fixed by law, and this is legislation on an appropriation bill and unauthorized by law.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to be heard on that. How can the gentleman show that this proposed increase in the number of chaplains is not authorized by law? Why are not the 25 with the pay as provided for in this amendment within the quota authorized by law? Does the gentleman know how many chaplains he has in the Army now?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas will address himself to the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. I am speaking to the point of order, Mr. Chairman. The burden is on the gentleman to show that this number does not come within the authorization of law.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. In the amendment of the national defense act we provide that there shall be 125 chaplains. We now have 123.

Mr. BLANTON. And one for so many officers and men?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. No; this is the amendment that changed that, when we cut down the size of the Army under the appropriation act of June 30, 1922.

Mr. BLANTON. We then provided for 125?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. One hundred and twenty-five.

Mr. BLANTON. And we now have only 123?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. One hundred and twenty-three, and you are trying to increase it here to 148, something absolutely unauthorized by law.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, then there are as many as two authorized by law; and if my colleague will change his amendment to embrace the salary of two of them, the point of order will not lie.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I would state to the gentleman that I do not think that would be sufficient. We need 25, so the administration says.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The burden of proof being upon the proponents of the proposition, and no proof having been presented to the Chair, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of getting some information. Under the subhead "Pay of enlisted men" there is a proviso added that the total authorized number of enlisted men, not including the Philippine Scouts, shall be 125,000. Under the subhead of "Pay of officers" there is no such proviso. Is the number of officers as immutable as the law of the Medes and Persians?

Mr. ANTHONY. The law fixes it at not more than 12,000.

Mr. KVALE. And that can not be changed?

Mr. ANTHONY. Oh, yes; you can reduce the amount appropriated in this bill by a limitation.

Mr. KVALE. But they will have a maximum number of 12,000?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. KVALE. Why is not the same proviso placed here as for enlisted men?

Mr. ANTHONY. Because it is the desire of the committee to provide enough money so that they may have the full number of officers authorized by law.

Mr. McKENZIE. And, if the gentleman will permit, is there not this further distinction that enlisted men are going out of the Army all of the time and the enlisted personnel can be regulated by appropriation, whereas the officers are commissioned in the Army, not for a year or two or three years, but for life, or so long as they behave themselves.

Mr. KVALE. What procedure would be necessary to cut down the number of officers?

Mr. ANTHONY. We would have to have legislation to do that.

Mr. KVALE. But we can reduce the amount of money appropriated, can we not?

Mr. ANTHONY. It is a question of whether that would be held in order. It probably would.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Will the gentleman from Kansas give me his attention? It is hard to gather the information I desire from the hearings, but would the gentleman advise the committee of the amount of money that has been allowed for barracks and improvement at Fort Schofield at the island of Oahu, Hawaii?

Mr. ANTHONY. There is no money for new construction authorized in the bill except one item at West Point.

Mr. RAKER. What is allowed for Fort Schofield for the repair and improvement of barracks?

Mr. ANTHONY. There is no specific amount allowed for Schofield barracks. They would share in the general appropriation of four million and some odd hundred thousand dollars for maintenance and repair.

Mr. RAKER. How much can the Army provide out of that appropriation to improve the living quarters of the men and officers at Fort Schofield, on the island of Oahu, Hawaiian Islands?

Mr. ANTHONY. That would be expended at the option of the War Department in such places as they may deem most urgent.

Mr. RAKER. Is there any amount allowed for the officers in charge of the submarine station at Pearl Harbor?

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not think there is anything in this bill covering the submarine base.

Mr. RAKER. I have been looking for it, but I can not find it.

Mr. ANTHONY. That would be in the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. RAKER. It would not come under this bill?

Mr. ANTHONY. No.

Mr. RAKER. Before the bill gets through and goes to the Senate, I am hoping that the chairman will see his way clear to allow money for improvement of quarters at Fort Schofield. I have made a number of visits at the barracks.

The officers and men are there with rain coming down through their quarters. The officers took us to their quarters, and their women folks have piled their clothing in the center of the room and put a canvas over it to keep it from being destroyed. Men in the ordinary walk of life would not do that. If my distinguished friend from Kansas had seen the condition I know that he would be ready and willing to even go beyond the Budget and provide quarters for these men at that place.

Mr. ANTHONY. I would remind the gentleman that for the last three years we have given the War Department all that it has asked and all that the Budget has asked for the repair of quarters of the kind described.

Mr. RAKER. Then, to make the matter clear, it is up to the War Department to furnish a sufficient amount of money to put these barracks and the living quarters of these men and officers in proper condition.

Mr. ANTHONY. It is at least up to the War Department to ask Congress for a sufficient sum of money, and if it does not it is its own fault.

Mr. RAKER. I thank the gentleman for that statement.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KVALE: Page 9, line 13, after the word "staff," strike out \$29,809,300 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$25,000,000: Provided, That the total authorized number of officers of the line and staff, not including the Philippine Scouts, shall be 10,000."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment. I do not make a point of order, and ask for a vote on it.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Nothing contained in this act, or any other act, shall be construed as depriving any commissioned officer of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of his right to pay and allowances while serving on such duty as the President may direct in the coordination of the business of the Government, as now being conducted by him under the general supervision of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order to the paragraph. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee a question, but before doing so I should like to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will asking the chairman of the committee a question waive the point of order in any way; otherwise, I shall make it now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can reserve the point of order.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. What is the object of this section? How many officers does it affect and whom does it affect?

Mr. ANTHONY. There are a number of officers in the Army serving in the Bureau of the Budget for the purpose, as the item says, of coordinating the work there. There are 26 officers altogether. They come from both the Army and the Navy.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. That is in addition to the officers detailed in each bureau as Budget officers?

Mr. ANTHONY. That is true. They augment the working division of those bureaus.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Twenty-six are in the Budget Bureau?

Mr. ANTHONY. Throughout the country.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Doing Budget work?

Mr. ANTHONY. Doing Budget work of coordinating these governmental activities for the purpose of aiding the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I never understood the use of the word "coordinating" as used by committees of this House. Further reserving the right to object, I want to say just a few words. The chairman of the subcommittee admits that this language in this bill will affect 26 Army and Navy officers who are not performing duty as Army or Navy officers, strictly speaking, but are performing duties in connection with this bureau we have established here known as the Bureau of the Budget.

The purpose of this act is to permit them to perform civil duties, and yet retain their status and emoluments as military officers, 26 in one bureau. Mr. Chairman, it is an indictment of the citizenship of America, the civilian citizenship, to say that this great Bureau of the Budget can not operate without military aid and the installation of 26 military officers to visé, to oversee and pass upon the work that the Constitution vests in the Congress of the United States. It is our business to appropriate money. It is the business of the Congress to control the purse strings, and yet the chairman of this committee comes in here and admits that there are no civilians available, there is nobody who can perform this duty, but they must militarize, they must Prussianize it.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I yield.

Mr. ANTHONY. Of course, one result of this use of officers is to save the salary, probably, of 26 high-priced civilian employees who would probably cost the Government much more than the salaries of these officers, and as we would have to pay their salary anyway the Government is that much ahead.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Oh, yes; the gentleman from Kansas when he wants to plead economy is always plausible, when he wants more Army officers that cost money he is always plausible, and yet the Committee on Military Affairs is always complaining we have not got enough officers in the Army properly to officer the Army. They say we have not got enough officers in the Army to perform military duty, and yet they have got enough to send 26 out of the Army to perform duties that ought to be performed by civilians, and it is an indictment of the civilian citizenship of America. I do not object to an Army officer because he is an Army officer, but I want him to be an Army officer, and I do object to any Army officer performing civil functions, and I will tell you why. It is not an objection to their personality, it is not objection because they are wearing a uniform, but any bureaucrat, even a civilian bureaucrat, is autocrat enough. They all become autocrats after a while; but when you take a man whose training has been in the military branch or the naval branch, brought up at West Point or Annapolis, accustomed to military discipline and military orders, to military ukases and edicts, and install him in a great bureau like the Bureau of the Budget or the Government Bureau of Engraving and Printing or any civilian post and put him in to conduct civilian affairs, that, gentlemen, is contrary to the genius of this Government, it is contrary to our best ideals. While I know my protest will not have any effect with the gentleman from Kansas—of course, it will not—and it will not have any effect on the gentleman from Iowa, who sits in his place sneeringly smiling while I invoke these fundamental principles.

No; they will not have any effect on these gentlemen. They are economists. They want to militarize the civilian service of this Government of the people, and attempt to justify themselves, in so doing, by saying that they are saving the pay of these Army officers. Have you not got anything else for the Army officers to do? How will you save money?

Gentlemen, already this Bureau of the Budget has encroached upon the functions of this Congress. We stand on this floor as the Representatives of the people and we boast of the fact that the Budget did this, or did that, or the other thing, when under the Constitution of the United States the power to con-

trol the purse strings of this Nation resides in this Chamber and in the Chamber at the other end of the Capitol, and it is a confession of your own weakness to turn it over to the Budget. And then, when you turn it over to the Budget, instead of turning it over to civilians, instead of turning it over to people who understand the people of America, who might be responsive sometimes to considerations that appeal to civilians, you turn it over to a military bureaucracy. And then you get up here and boast about the Budget approving this thing, or about the Budget not approving it.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, this is just a tendency toward centralization, toward iron rule, toward controlling the action of Congress through the executive department, and I protest against militarizing our Government any further. [Applause.]

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have been lectured by one member of the Texas delegation this morning on my morals. [Laughter.] Now I am being lectured with reference to my economic policies. I did not know that I was answerable in all of these respects to the members of the Texas delegation. [Laughter.]

I contend that this provision of the law is permanent law. It is permanent law by reason of the very wording of the statute, "or any other act." Ever since we organized the Budget Bureau this has been the provision under which they have allocated certain officers of the Army to the Bureau of the Budget to perform these duties.

Now, the scare that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is trying to bring in here and throw on this House is entirely answered by the fact that these men—I care not how bureaucratic they may be—have done a good job in economizing under the Bureau of the Budget, and it is on account of the fact that some of these men have not been able to "raid" the Treasury that they come in here and have criticized the Bureau of the Budget on account of its personnel being largely made up of Army officers. It may be that Army officers do some things that I do not approve of, as newspaper reports from the State of Michigan concerning a certain lawsuit would indicate. [Laughter.] But I do maintain that the work they have done down in the Bureau of the Budget has been good work, and I think the country will do well by having it continued. We should not permit them to be thrown out there and substitute all civilians on the ground that the Army officers have not been acting efficiently or rendering efficient service. I say that under this system the Bureau of the Budget has been efficient. It has been doing the things that both parties have expected it to do when it was put down there, and I contend that the gentleman from Texas would be placing a handicap on the Budget Bureau when he would have this provision in the bill cut out. It is permanent law, and it is not necessary to carry it in this bill at all for the reason that it says that "Nothing contained in this act, or any other act, shall be construed as depriving any commissioned officer of the Army," and so forth.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order, and I want to submit a few remarks on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The point of order is that this is an appropriation bill, and this language is legislation; and it is not only legislation in so far as this particular bill is concerned, but it undertakes also to amend other acts of Congress, because the language "or any other act" would certainly have the effect, if passed, of making any other act of Congress, whether it is temporary or permanent, yield to this language; and, secondly, it would be amendatory of all existing acts on the statute books that might be at variance with this language. Therefore it ought to be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, or to the Committee on Naval Affairs, of which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] is such a distinguished and able exponent and chairman.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not want it.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The gentleman from Pennsylvania does not want it, because he knows this is wrong.

Mr. BUTLER. I think it is a good thing to give those people things to do that they know how to do. Some of these men can advise civilians. They understand this technical material that comes from the departments.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Each department has its own budget officer who is not detailed away from his place.

If this is existing law, it does not belong to this bill. It is still legislation; it may be ineffective legislation, or it may be unnecessary legislation, or it may be wholly inoperative. But it is still legislation, and therefore it ought to go out of this bill.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair will permit, I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] to page 365 of the House Digest and Manual, where it is stated that "Existing law may be repeated verbatim in an appropriation bill." That is just exactly what has been done in this bill. We repeated the same language that was carried in the bill last year, and I contend, as does my colleague from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON], that it is in reality permanent law.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The language carried in the bill? Mr. ANTHONY. The appropriation bill. The language itself makes it permanent law.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The appropriation bill will not be effective until July 1, and this is effective after July 1, if the Chair please.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] contend that the similar provision in the last appropriation bill was permanent legislation?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes. By the language itself it is permanent law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will point out to the gentleman that the language did not contain the word "hereafter."

Mr. ANTHONY. The words "or any other act" should have the same effect; "Nothing contained in this act, or any other act," and so forth.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In answer to the query of the Chair, addressed to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY], on the same page of the Manual which the Chair cited, page 363, is this ruling:

The reenactment from year to year of a law intended to apply during the year of its enactment only is not relieved, however, from the point that it is legislation.

Citing a decision—which I have not had time to examine—in Volume IV of Hinds' Precedents on a similar proposition.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I am sure the Chair recognizes the rule that has been quoted by the gentleman from Alabama, and that heretofore, as suggested by the Chair, when it is intended to make anything permanent law in an appropriation bill the word "hereafter" has generally if not always been used. The bill for the current year dies on the 1st day of July and everything in it dies unless it is made clearly to appear that it was the intention of Congress to make it effective after July 1. The bill of last year, to which the gentleman refers, did not repeal any existing acts; it simply held those acts in suspension for one year, and upon the 1st day of next July all of these other acts will immediately come back into full force and effect unless this language is carried in this bill.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be well to make one further observation and that is that no particular personnel has ever been authorized for the Budget Bureau. It was assumed under the law organizing the Budget Bureau that there would be an allocation of officers from other departments of the Government to that bureau in order to help carry on the work, and I think that ought to be given some consideration in the construction of this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair is not satisfied that the provision in the last appropriation bill clearly conveyed the intent that it should be permanent legislation. Therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having taken the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 62) to create two judicial districts within the State of Indiana, the establishment of judicial divisions therein, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SHORTRIDGE, Mr. ERNST, and Mr. OVERMAN as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer an amendment to the section just read. I want to offer this as original matter in place of the language stricken out by the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, after line 13, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"No part of any of the sums appropriated under Title I hereof shall be used for pay or allowances of any officer who may be assigned or

designated for the performance of any service other than that strictly within the line of his duty as such officer."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If the amendment is subject to a point of order, we might as well dispose of that question now, but I do not think it is.

Mr. ANTHONY. I make the point of order that it is new legislation and interferes with Executive discretion.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, it is certainly clearly within the rule that it is a limitation upon the appropriation. Here is an appropriation in the sum of \$29,809,300 to cover the pay of officers of the Army. Immediately following that I propose a limitation that no part of that appropriation shall be paid to any officer of the Army of the United States who shall be assigned to any other duty than that strictly within the line of his duty as such officer. In other words, it clearly presents, by a limitation, the proposition just suggested by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and I can not conceive, if the Chair please, where it is not strictly a limitation upon the appropriation authorized in the bill. That is the only proposition which would make it in order, namely, that it is a limitation upon the amount of the appropriation.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest, in reply to the gentleman from Alabama, that there are numerous privileges under existing Army acts under which the Executive has the right to assign to officers of the Army, by commission or otherwise, duties outside of his regular duties. I think Colonel Sherrill, in the city of Washington, is an officer who is acting under one of those special commissions. If you put this limitation in the bill you say that no Army officer should have the right to be so assigned, under such a provision of law, by the commanding officer of the Army, by the Secretary of War, or by the Executive head of our Government. It would take men off of river and harbor work—such men as General Taylor.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. In connection with such designations I will call the gentleman's attention to the fact that this morning's press stated that there had been two new designations of naval officers as aids at the White House, two additional in addition to those already assigned. Does the gentleman mean to include those?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I am not familiar with the Navy bill or with naval matters, and I refer the gentleman to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The gentleman means to include, of course, General Butler, in Philadelphia, who is in the military service, but who is acting chief of police there?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. He is not drawing any pay at all from the Government.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. But he is keeping his status, is he not?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. The two naval officers whom the gentleman has referred to as having been recently assigned as aides are to continue in their present duties as well, their assignment as aides to the President being in addition to their present duties. It in no sense means that they are being taken away from military duties.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I merely make the further suggestion that if you put in a limitation of this kind you seriously interfere with the right of the Executive as to the performance of duties by Army officers under the law. This is not only a limitation but it is legislation on an appropriation bill, and therefore I think it is clearly subject to the point of order made by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The precedents of the House go even further in this matter than would suffice to reject the point of order. The Chair rules this is a limitation on the bill and is in order.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to rise in opposition to the amendment. If I recall the language—

Mr. BANKHEAD. Well, I am entitled to the floor as the proponent of the amendment in order to make a statement with reference to it.

Mr. ANTHONY. I will be glad to let the gentleman make his statement now or after I get through.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will make my statement now. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee: My colleague from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] so very clearly announced the attitude I hold with reference to this proposition that I shall take only a few moments without elaborating the argument made by

him. I am offering this amendment upon this theory, and I think it ought to commend itself to the judgment of the committee. We have a tremendous organization here composing the Army of the United States, a very large officered personnel. Now, surely the original intention of Congress, properly interpreted, was that appropriations should be made for the support of the Army of the United States to perform strictly military duties.

Mr. BARBOUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. BARBOUR. Would it not be rather difficult sometimes to define just what are strictly military duties?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Well, I think the long line of interpretations by The Adjutant General and others, whose duty it is to instruct the officers of the Army of the United States as to what are and what are not their duties, should not cause any very great confusion about that.

Mr. BARBOUR. For the enlightenment of the House on this particular amendment, would it include river and harbor work? Would that be included in military duties?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Properly construed, I think it would be; yes; because that is a function that is conferred by statute upon the Chief of Engineers and would clearly be within the line of their military duties as such; but will the gentleman contend that the designation of officers of the Army of the United States for the performance of mere civil duties like those pertaining to the fiscal policy of the Government is within the original conception of the duties of a military officer?

Mr. BARBOUR. I think some of them may very well be considered so.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Well, I do not agree with the gentleman's construction.

What I want to present to the House and what I want to give this committee a clear opportunity to express itself upon is whether or not it is not an abuse, whether by discretion or by statute or by usage, of the real purpose of the duties of a military officer, trained and paid by the Government for the performance of strictly military duties, to have 1 or 10 or 100 of those men, either by Executive order or by some sort of precedent or by some unauthorized appropriation bill, assigned to the performance of duties that are not within the line and scope of their employment and pay by the United States Government.

I want to say to you, gentlemen, it is a matter that is being abused. We are all anxious to reduce the appropriations. We are all anxious and we are all trying to limit the Army of the United States in its officers and enlisted personnel to the lowest decent maximum consistent with the public safety; and yet when we authorize a large number of the officers of the Army of the United States to be assigned to the performance of clerical or fiscal or municipal duties, then I say that in that measure we are continuing unnecessary appropriations upon the taxpayers of the United States, and Congress is the only authority that can correct that abuse—if it is an abuse—and Congress has the sole function to declare what the policy shall be with reference to this practice.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT and Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa rose.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield to the gentleman from New York, who rose first.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Would the gentleman apply that rule to the relations between all departments of the Government?

Mr. BANKHEAD. We are not discussing at this time anything except the relations of the officers of the Army to the Government.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. And the gentleman would say there is some peculiar reason why an officer of the United States Army who has developed—

Mr. BANKHEAD. I take the position that an officer of the United States Army as well as of the Navy of the United States or the Marine Corps ought to perform the functions for which he is commissioned and none other. If there are civil duties that ought to be performed certainly the Government can afford to secure men who have the capacity and character to perform duties of that nature.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. May I ask the gentleman another question?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will be glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Would the gentleman carry it to the extent, for example, of precluding the use of officers of the Army for such work as was done in Russia by the commission headed by Colonel Haskell?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not recall now the authorization that justified that commission. I think the President of the United States—and I think the gentleman from New York as a military man will agree with me—has the authority as

Commander in Chief to order any member of the Army upon an expedition of that sort as the performance of a military duty, and I think that is what was done in that case.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. No; there was nothing of a military nature in connection with that commission.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am not familiar with the duties they performed. What I am attempting to do here is to assert a principle of action that ought to be uniform and ought to be restrictive. I do not know that a majority of my colleagues will agree with me, but it seems to me that military officers ought to perform military duties, and where there are civilian duties to be performed for the Government of the United States or for some municipal organization or for some eleemosynary institution, those things ought to be open to civil employees, and that to the extent you use Army officers to perform such duties you are depriving qualified civilians of the opportunity of that employment, and I do not think it is right. [Applause.]

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield for just one further question?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I want to yield to the gentleman from Iowa also, but I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I have just one more question: Would the gentleman carry that principle to the extent of absolutely depriving the Government and the people of the United States of the qualities developed by Army officers in connection with the performance of their duties?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes in order to answer these questions.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman from New York has asked me if I would be willing to do so-and-so in certain contingencies. All that I am attempting to do is to present my views upon this particular proposition as affecting the officers of the Army of the United States. I think the language of my amendment is clear and is easily understood by the learned gentleman from New York and can be easily interpreted in its effect.

I now yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. The gentleman voted for the Budget bill?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I was on the committee and helped to prepare the Budget legislation and voted for the Budget bill.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. The gentleman will recall in that bill there was provision made for the allocation of men from other departments of the Government to the Budget Bureau for the purpose of performing the work of that bureau.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Well, if we made a mistake at that time, the time possibly has come to correct it by this legislation.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. And it will take \$60,000 out of the Public Treasury to pay the salaries of civil employees to take the place of the men performing this duty.

Mr. BANKHEAD. But I assert, and my whole argument is based upon the single proposition, that military men should perform military duties and that civil employees should be employed to perform civil duties for the Government of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

I question very seriously whether military men should be limited wholly and always to what the gentleman chooses to consider military duties. If they have a little experience to broaden them out and give them some practical training along other lines, it is serving a very good purpose. The ruling of the Chair a moment ago, which may be justified under parliamentary precedents, is going to cost the Treasury, if these 26 men allocated from the Army are drawing an average salary of \$4,000 a year, \$104,000 a year, and the Army is going to be no better off than it would be if these men got some practical business training in this way.

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman is coming right to the critical point, it seems to me. What is the annual salary of the Army officers that are detailed for this work? Are they captains or lieutenant colonels or are they sergeants? What is their rank?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I am assuming that the salary of these 26 men will average \$4,000 each, if not well over that amount.

Mr. BEGG. Is it not true that every time a man is taken out of the Army and put in somewhere else they promote a lieutenant colonel to take his place?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. They do not take in any more officers into the Army because of these assignments, but you would have more civilians on the pay roll if you did not take these men out of the Army.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman answer a question?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. If I can.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman is not prepared to state whether the Government is saving any money or not?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I am not prepared to say how much salary they receive; but suppose they receive \$3,000, that would be \$78,000, or if they receive \$4,000 that would be \$104,000. There will be just as many officers on the pay roll of the Army and there will be 26 additional civilians employed.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Carrying out the gentleman's position to its logical conclusion, to save money between \$3,000 and \$5,000 and \$12,000 salaries, the gentleman would be in favor of allocating Army officers to the 10 Cabinet positions?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I do not think that conclusion could be drawn from anything I have said, but I will say that if we had four or five hundred Army officers allocated to different work we might be just as well off.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is not in favor of putting the Government into the hands of Army and naval officers, is he?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. No; I am not; but the allocation of a few men here and there, as is being done, is not going to place the country under the Army and it is a saving to the taxpayers.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman want to see this Government get into the position that Russia is in?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I should dislike very much to see this country in the position of Russia, but this does not lead to anything of that kind. I believe the amendment will add approximately \$100,000 additional tax on the Treasury, and it ought to be defeated. I want to save the hundred thousand for the taxpayers without in any way injuring the Army.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will not be adopted. It ought to be defeated for vagueness and indefiniteness. I have read the amendment carefully, and I do not believe that anybody can tell what it would do if it should be adopted. If adopted in its present shape it might take away the Army engineers having the river and harbor work in charge, and all work in that direction would stop. It might stop the work on the Panama Canal. It reaches too far and is too dangerous in the present wording of the amendment.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I think there ought to be a further suggestion as to this amendment, and that is if legislation is going to be brought in here it ought to be brought in by a committee that has considered it. This is far-reaching; it reaches into every department of the Government. It is brought on the floor not even carefully worded. The committee is asked to adopt it as a protest against a few men being put in the Budget department. We ought not to enact legislation in this way.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman says that the language of the amendment is vague and its meaning can not be clearly ascertained. The gentleman understands the purpose and meaning of the amendment.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I think it is very vague, and no one knows what the effect will be in the War Department. It might interfere with the Panama Canal; it might interfere with the river and harbor work.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman says it might interfere with the Panama Canal and the river and harbor work. There can be no such construction of that kind put upon it. The existing law makes it the duty of certain men to be assigned to that work, and this could not affect the permanent duties delegated to Army officers.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. All it would do would be to take the pay away from them. You are endangering the river and harbor work and all that kind of work by such legislation, and you do not know how far-reaching it will be. I think the amendment ought to be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa) there were 21 ayes and 31 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pay of enlisted men: For pay of enlisted men of the line and staff, not including the Philippine Scouts, \$51,090,846: *Provided*, That the total authorized number of enlisted men, not including the Philippine Scouts, shall be 125,000.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KVALE: Page 10, lines 9 and 11, after the word "Scouts," strike out "\$51,090,846" and, in line 11, "125,000," and insert in lieu thereof the following: In line 9, "\$40,000,000" and, in line 11, "100,000."

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that with 4,000,000 men that we have left over from the war, all trained, it should not be necessary to have more than 100,000 men in the Regular Army. I can not understand how all of the 35 members of the committee can go along defending the number of 125,000 men in the Regular Army. I would like to hear why they think it is necessary to have all these men when we have 4,000,000 men who will be ready to spring to arms when any danger comes to the country.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KVALE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. You have got to have so many men for every officer, and we have provided about twice as many officers as we had immediately before the war. They made all promotions until there was a time when we did not have a single second lieutenant. The gentleman will remember that.

Mr. KVALE. Does the gentleman contend that we must have so many men for each officer?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, no; I am with the gentleman. I am going to vote for his amendment, though I think there is small chance of its being adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BLACK of Texas: Page 10, line 11, at the end of the line, strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following language: "*Provided further*, That hereafter upon the presentation of satisfactory evidence as to his age and upon application for discharge by his parent or guardian presented to the Secretary of War within six months after the date of his enlistment, any man enlisted after July 1, 1925, in the Army under 21 years of age who has enlisted without the written consent of his parent or guardian, if any, shall be discharged, with the form of discharge certificate and the traveling and other allowances to which his service after enlistment shall entitle him."

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this is the same amendment that was offered to H. R. 2688, a bill dealing with sundry matters affecting the Navy, on December 10 last by my colleague from Texas, Mr. JONES. It is an amendment prepared by him, which I have offered at his suggestion, because he is unable to be present to-day and present it in person.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. This just changes the present law in one particular. It gives them 6 months instead of 60 days within which to file their applications for discharge.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. That is true; and The Adjutant General, in the hearings, as the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. ANTHONY] will remember, stated that the law was working out very satisfactorily to the Army, and the only difficulty which he pointed out was the fact that under the 60-day limitation about one-third of the applications have been denied because they were not filed within the time permitted by law. I think that six months is long enough to allow, but I am equally well convinced that the present limitation of allowing only 60 days within which the parent or guardian must file application is entirely too short a time.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Is the language exactly word for word that which was put into the Navy bill?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Yes. The amendment was prepared by my colleague [Mr. JONES], but I also compared it myself with the language in the bill H. R. 2688, which has already passed the House, and it is identically the same.

Mr. ANTHONY. This matter of the enlistment of minors is causing almost no trouble now in the Army, and I do not think

that the amendment offered by the gentleman would be objectionable.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. With the remarks made by the chairman of the subcommittee, of course, I do not care to say anything further. If he is satisfied, I am sure the House will follow his judgment and adopt the amendment without objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For rental allowances, including allowances for quarters for enlisted men on duty where public quarters are not available, \$6,200,000.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman whether allowance for rent of quarters is made where the quarters are available in any of the posts or stations? Is it necessary to first use up all of the quarters that are available?

Mr. ANTHONY. They are supposed to do that.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Are they doing that?

Mr. ANTHONY. The way the Army is stationed it is impossible to do it, but there has been a constant pressure from the committee that they should utilize all of the modern barracks and quarters possible.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Here is an allowance of \$6,200,000. That is quite an item for rentals. At stations where there are available quarters are they permitted to live in the city? Is that optional?

Mr. ANTHONY. The largest part of this item is included in the pay of officers where there are no quarters available for the officers. All of the officers on duty here in Washington, for instance, are included in that. There are no quarters available for them.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY POSTS

For the construction and enlargement at military posts of such buildings as in the judgment of the Secretary of War may be necessary, including all appurtenances thereto, \$100.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking whether provisions are made for the building of quarters at Mitchell Field?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I do not understand that any provision is made for building any quarters in this bill.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I understood that appropriations were to be made this year. Some of the buildings there are in an unsanitary condition.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. No provision in this bill is made for the construction program. That has been submitted to the Military Affairs Committee and all construction is left out of this bill, except the mess hall at West Point.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

BARRACKS AND QUARTERS

For construction, repair, and rental of barracks, quarters, stables, storehouses, magazines, administration and office buildings, sheds, shops, garages, reclamation plants, and other buildings necessary for the shelter of the Army and its property, including retired officers and enlisted men when ordered to active duty; for rental of grounds for military purposes, of recruiting stations, and of lodgings for recruits and applicants for enlistment; for repair of such furniture for Government-owned officers' quarters and officers' messes as may be approved by the Secretary of War; for wall lockers, refrigerators, screen doors, window screens, storm doors and sash, window shades, and flooring and framing for tents, \$4,250,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for rental of offices, garages, and stables for military attachés: *Provided further*, That \$29,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be used for repairing buildings within the old fort at Fort Ontario, N. Y., and placing them in habitable condition.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma: Page 27, line 4, after the word "condition," change the period to a colon and add the following: "*Provided further*, That \$3,500 of this appropriation shall be available for the purchase of approximately 43.6 acres of land opposite the Fort Reno, Okla., pumping plant, to be used in an effort to straighten the course of the North Canadian River."

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not increase the appropriation. It simply provides that \$3,500 of the appropriation shall be used for the purchase of a small tract of land adjacent to the Fort Reno Military Reservation. Agents of the War Department went down to this reservation and made a lease with a farmer named Joseph D. Stevens. In this lease the War Department had a right to dig a ditch across this tract to straighten a small stream called the Washita River, which makes a bend into the reservation at this point. This river is not what we usually call a river. It is a deep ravine, a deep canyon through the valley.

The river bend is directly in front of the pumping plant, and when the river gets on the flood stage it eats into the bank and has gradually eaten its way almost to the pumping plant. It probably now is about 150 feet from the pumping plant. The War Department, in order to change the course of the river, desires this land for the cutting of a ditch to divert the trend of this river from this pumping station. The lease, which was made in December, 1923, expires on the 30th of June of this year. The ditch has been dug, the river channel has been straightened, and unless the War Department exercises its option to buy this land on or before the 30th day of June of this year the owner of the land will find himself in the following condition: He has surrendered possession of the land; the ditch has been cut; the lease will expire; he will have lost the land and will have no recourse. The department promised Mr. Stevens that the lease was only temporary and it would pay him for the land as soon as the money was made available. Last winter I introduced an amendment to the War Department appropriation bill providing for the purchase of this land. A point of order was made that the amendment was not germane to the reservation because there is a river between the land and the reservation. If that point of order was good then it is not good now, because since that time the ditch has been cut and the channel of the river has been changed and the land is not now cut off by the river. This matter was presented to the War Department and the department has made an effort, I understand, to get approval of the item from the Budget Bureau. The Budget Bureau held that it had no authority to include the item in the bill.

The War Department is without authority to make the purchase unless authorized, and I am now seeking by this amendment to authorize the closing of this transaction between this farmer and the War Department. The War Department can not make payment until they have authority, the Budget Committee can not insert the item without authority, and Congress is the only place where authority can be granted. If this course is not followed it will take a special act of Congress authorizing the appropriation and then a special item in some future appropriation bill to settle with Mr. Stevens. With this statement I trust the committee will not insist on the point of order.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. How fast is this ravine eating in the direction of the pumping plant?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It depends upon the severity of the flood and the velocity with which the water runs through the river bend. There might not be another flood for years, but a year ago there were two floods which did great damage.

I might state I conferred first with the chairman of the subcommittee and he interposed no objection to my offering the amendment.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

RENT OF BUILDINGS, QUARTERMASTER CORPS

For rent of buildings and parts of buildings in the District of Columbia for military purposes, \$32,982: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available if space is provided by the Public Buildings Commission in Government-owned buildings.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. What is this item of \$32,982, if I may ask the committee, for rent of buildings and parts of buildings, District of Columbia?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Not all the military activities of the District of Columbia are in Government buildings. There is a stable and warehouse, not public property, at 230 Nineteenth

Street NW., for which we are paying \$4,800; 240-248 Nineteenth Street there is a garage, stable, warehouse for which we pay \$9,000 a year—

Mr. BRIGGS. I do not care as to items particularly, but I just wanted to inquire generally.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. There are certain parts of the Army equipment—

Mr. BRIGGS. Such as stables, and so forth?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Stables, garages, warehouses, where the Government can not furnish them, and they are rented.

Mr. BRIGGS. It is not for office quarters?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Oh, absolutely not.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF SIGNAL OFFICER

Salaries: For personal services in the District of Columbia in accordance with "The classification act of 1923," \$57,000.

The services of skilled draftsmen and such other services as the Secretary of War may deem necessary may be employed only in the Signal Office to carry into effect the various appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, and for the Signal Service of the Army, to be paid from such appropriations, in addition to the foregoing employees appropriated for in the signal office: *Provided*, That the entire expenditures for this purpose for the fiscal year 1926 shall not exceed \$35,000, and the Secretary of War shall each year in the Budget report to Congress the number of persons so employed, their duties, and the amount paid to each.

Mr. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I have moved to strike out the last word at this time for the purpose of calling the attention of the committee to two amendments I am going to offer. The first amendment which I shall speak on for five minutes is one which does away with competitive bidding in the purchase of the new airplanes under this appropriation, and provides that orders and work shall not be given to foreigners.

Every year since the armistice the War and Navy Departments have come to Congress asking for more money for airplanes, always with the argument that it is necessary to purchase airplanes to build up the commercial aircraft industry of this country.

The Army and Navy Departments have never had any settled program or policy for equipping their departments, as they do in European countries, where they order, say, 100 airplanes, and as soon as that hundred airplanes are delivered they place another order for another hundred, and then follow this with another order for 100, taking into consideration improvements or requirements made necessary by the flying of the machines.

Thus, they not only keep the equipment up to full strength but always up to date.

Our air services have done spasmodic buying, and they have not followed the law in all cases where they were required to advertise for bids and purchase airplanes on competitive bidding, but when they so desire they purchase under that section of the statute which excepts from advertising or competitive bidding those articles which were proprietary or patented. In this way they have discouraged a great many airplane manufacturers and caused a good deal of jealousy and ill feeling in the industry.

General Patrick and Admiral Moffett testified before the aircraft inquiry committee, and they both told of the hardships worked on the industry by the competitive bidding. General Patrick said that it was the desire of the department to get away from competitive bidding, and that the assistance of the Aircraft Inquiry Committee was requested to amend the law.

I am convinced that it is the real desire of the departments to do this; and I am also convinced that it is to the best interests of the aircraft industry of this country that competitive bidding be abolished, for without a sound aircraft industry there can be no adequate air defense.

Under existing legislation (U. S. Comp. Stat. 1916, 6869; R. S. 3721, purchase without advertisements) the Navy Department is authorized to purchase in the open market without advertisements or competitive bids such items so essential to the national security as cheese, butter, tobacco, and ordnance.

What I propose is to put the purchase of aircraft, which is to-day the dominant arm of defense, on the same footing with the big guns that are fast becoming obsolete.

Instead of adopting a continuing policy of procurement both Army and Navy services have permitted themselves to get

into a condition whereby when it suits their convenience they insist on purchasing aircraft through cut-throat competitive bidding, or if they desire to punish one manufacturer or favor another, they can find excuses under the law which permits buying proprietary designs or patented articles without competition to allocate orders as they see fit.

Competitive bidding has reduced the essential aircraft industry to a condition approaching bankruptcy and has thus, through diminishing the source of supply, placed the air defenses of the United States in grave peril, and the heads of the air services all say that we now have no commercial aircraft industry in this country to speak of.

General Patrick stated before the House Committee on Air Service Inquiry:

These men and firms were all eager for work. They bid. There are specific cases where they bid far below the cost of production. Such companies have either failed or gone out of business. This has lessened the number of them, and in some ways it is an advantage and in others it is a disadvantage. The result was that had we opened everything to competitive bidding there would have been to-day the situation, I think, probably of very, very few men who would be in the aircraft business.

General Patrick further said:

We have recognized the proprietary rights of designers in their designs of aircraft and have let contracts in accordance with that understanding. I said it was the policy to recognize the design rights in all such designs as were presented by any concern that was capable of building them and contracts have been given them. So far as our bids were concerned, when we had to resort to open competition there was no restriction placed upon the bidder; anyone was authorized to bid and they did so.

Asked specifically what he would suggest to improve the industry, General Patrick said:

In some way arrange so that orders can be placed with these manufacturers, possibly at the discretion of the Secretary of War, or in some other way that the committee might devise that would give manufacturers an assurance of continuity in their work. If we could be relieved from what is really now a statutory requirement inviting competition for bids, if the Secretary of War or some other proper authority could be authorized in his discretion to place orders without competition, to allocate the amount of business that the War Department has among these manufacturers, it would be the greatest step in advance that could be taken. That would mean, of course, not alone the War Department, but the Navy Department and all other departments needs for aircraft until the point is reached that commercial air transportation has come into being and until there is a commercial development upon which these various manufacturers can rely.

General Patrick stated that he wanted to purchase airplanes just as he purchased motor cars—in the open market.

While the American industry is starving we have an extraordinary situation in the Army Air Service placing an order for 100 airplanes, costing \$350,000, to be built by a foreigner named Fokker.

Major General Patrick, when asked what he knew of Fokker, said:

He is a Hollander who had some knowledge of airplane designing, and when the World War broke out he tried to get employment. I think he went to the English. I have heard that he did, although I do not know of my own knowledge, and they would not take him; and finally he went to the Germans and he became the principal airplane builder for the Germans. After the war he went back to Amsterdam and established himself there.

I am told that Fokker is manufacturing airplanes for Japan and for Russia, and now he appears on our shores and gets a juicy plum while our Americans starve in the industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AIR SERVICE

AIR SERVICE, ARMY

For creating, maintaining, and operating at established flying schools and balloon schools courses of instruction for officers, students, and enlisted men, including cost of equipment and supplies necessary for instruction, purchase of tools, equipment, materials, machines, textbooks, books of reference, scientific and professional papers, instruments and materials for theoretical and practical instruction; for maintenance, repair, storage, and operation of airships, war balloons, and other aerial machines, including instruments, materials, gas plants, hangars, and repair shops, and appliances of every sort and description necessary for the operation, construction, or equipment of all types of

aircraft, and all necessary spare parts and equipment connected therewith and the establishment of landing and take-off runways; for purchase of supplies for securing, developing, printing, and reproducing photographs in connection with aerial photography; improvement, equipment, maintenance, and operation of plants for testing and experimental work, and procuring and introducing water, electric light and power, gas and sewerage, including maintenance, operation, and repair of such utilities at such plants; for the acquisition of land or interest in land by purchase, lease, or condemnation where necessary to explore for, procure, or reserve helium gas, and also for the purchase, manufacture, construction, maintenance, and operation of plants for the production thereof and experimentation therewith; salaries and wages of civilian employees as may be necessary, and payment of their traveling and other necessary expenses as authorized by existing law; transportation of materials in connection with consolidation of Air Service activities; experimental investigation and purchase and development of new types of aircraft, accessories thereto, and aviation engines, including licenses for patents and design rights thereto, and plans, drawings, and specifications thereof; for the purchase, manufacture, and construction of airships, balloons, and other aerial machines, including instruments, gas plants, hangars, and repair shops, and appliances of every sort and description necessary for the operation, construction, or equipment of all types of aircraft, and all necessary spare parts and equipment connected therewith; for the marking of military airways where the purchase of land is not involved; for the purchase, manufacture, and issue of special clothing, wearing apparel, and similar equipment for aviation purposes; for all necessary expenses connected with the sale or disposal of surplus or obsolete aeronautical equipment, and the rental of buildings, and other facilities for the handling or storage of such equipment; for the services of such consulting engineers at experimental stations of the Air Service as the Secretary of War may deem necessary, including necessary traveling expenses; purchase of special apparatus and appliances, repairs and replacements of same used in connection with special scientific medical research in the Air Service; for maintenance and operation of such Air Service printing plants outside of the District of Columbia as may be authorized in accordance with law; for publications, station libraries, special furniture, supplies and equipment for offices, shops, and laboratories; for special services, including the salvaging of wrecked aircraft, \$14,700,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$2,690,000 from this appropriation may be expended for pay and expenses of civilian employees other than those employed in experimental and research work; not exceeding \$500,000 may be expended for experimentation, conservation, and production of helium; not exceeding \$2,730,000 may be expended for experimental and research work with airplanes or lighter-than-air craft and their equipment, including the pay of necessary civilian employees; not exceeding \$400,000 may be expended for the production of lighter-than-air equipment; not exceeding \$300,000 may be expended for improvement of stations, hangars, and gas plants for the Regular Army and for such other markings and fuel supply stations and temporary shelter as may be necessary; not less than \$4,400,000 shall be expended for the production and purchase of new airplanes and their equipment, spare parts, and accessories; not more than \$4,000 may be expended for settlement of claims (not exceeding \$250 each) for damages to persons and private property resulting from the operation of aircraft at home and abroad when each claim is substantiated by a survey report of a board of officers appointed by the commanding officer of the nearest aviation post and approved by the Chief of Air Service and the Secretary of War; not less than \$50,000 of this amount shall be used for the conduct of airplane bombing tests against obsolete vessels moving under their own power: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy and the United States Shipping Board or the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation are hereby directed to transfer to the War Department for this purpose not to exceed two obsolete naval craft and two obsolete Shipping Board or United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation vessels, respectively, of such types as may be desired by the Chief of Air Service, United States Army, for the purpose set forth herein; and not exceeding \$500,000 shall be available immediately toward the transfer of the testing and experimental plant of the Air Service now located at McCook Field, Dayton, Ohio, and the reestablishment thereof on a permanent site in the same vicinity, including the preparation of grounds, construction of buildings, installation of roadways and utilities, and all other expenses of whatever character connected with this project, provided that such a site, satisfactory to the Secretary of War and on terms approved by him, is provided for this purpose without cost to the Government: *Provided further*, That the limitations contained in sections 1136 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to the work connected with this project: *And provided further*, That no part of said sum of \$500,000 shall be expended for buildings or improvements on land not owned in fee simple by the United States: *Provided further*, That section 3648, Revised Statutes, shall not apply to subscriptions for foreign and professional newspapers and periodicals to be paid for from this appropriation: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this title shall be used for the purpose of giving exhibition flights to the public other than those under the control and direction

of the War Department, and if such flights are given by Army personnel upon other than Government fields a bond of indemnity, in such sum as the Secretary of War may require for damages to person or property, shall be furnished the Government by the parties desiring the exhibition: *Provided further*, That in addition to the amount herein appropriated and specified for expenditure for the production and purchase of new airplanes and their equipment, spare parts, and accessories, the Chief of the Air Service, when authorized by the Secretary of War, may enter into contracts for the production and purchase of new airplanes and their equipment, spare parts, and accessories to an amount not in excess of \$2,150,000, and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof.

Mr. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REID of Illinois: Page 38, line 11: Strike out, after the word "herein," the rest of line 11, and all of lines 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20, and in line 21 the words "to the Government."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized. Mr. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this amendment goes to the amendment in the appropriation bill which provides \$500,000 for greater McCook Field. This appropriation is only the opening up of a new and perhaps limitless expenditure. An examination of the bill will show that I have tried to take out the entire sum.

Official figures compiled by the Air Service at my request and made a part of the record of the House aircraft investigation show that in the five fiscal years 1920-1924, inclusive, the Government of the United States has paid out for aviation the colossal sum of \$433,383,287.21.

This money has gone as follows:

Army Air Service	\$246,310,209.51
Navy Air Service	177,923,898.39
Air Mail Service	8,067,052.46
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	1,082,126.85

What this House should do is to put a stop to these huge expenditures or to insist that we get more for our money.

This waste is not due to graft, I am convinced, but it is due to feeding many mouths, swelling civilian pay rolls in Government plants, and scattering our air activities.

I do not propose to introduce now the subject of a separate Air Service, but I will say that no Member of this Congress who is in favor of a unified Air Service will vote for this McCook Field appropriation, opening the door of the Treasury as it does to increased waste in aircraft tinkering; and while this appropriation is only one-half million dollars it will bind the United States Government to pay many millions more on this project.

Brigadier General Mitchell, of the Army Air Service, said yesterday in a newspaper interview:

Establishment of a Government aviation department will take us out of the kindergarten class in flying and promote us to at least the first grade. * * * We are spending about \$82,000,000 a year on aviation, and that is plenty. The trouble is the money is being expended by 18 agencies. Experimental work is being duplicated. We are just fooling around. We are still in the kindergarten class. If all our air activities were concentrated under one department, there would be no duplication of endeavor. Expenditure of the same amount of money would bring 100 per cent better results.

I am convinced that no Member of this Congress, whether he be Republican, Democrat, Socialist—or prohibitionist, if there is any—who believes in President Coolidge's doctrine of economy and preparedness will vote for this appropriation.

WHAT MCCOOK FIELD HAS COST AND WHAT IT HAS PRODUCED

General Patrick states that the direct cost of the experimental and research division in the last five years has been \$20,000,000.

In response to questioning General Patrick could not recall a single outstanding airplane or engine that has been produced, exclusively, at McCook Field by the Army Air Service.

It developed at this inquiry that all that the engineering division does is to tinker with designs submitted by the industry or fiddle around with its own ideas, which ultimately have to be made practical by the industry.

The statement that the engineering division at McCook Field in five years has cost \$20,000,000 is not inclusive. It may, and probably does, refer to direct expenditures. What we want to learn is what has been the total cost—direct and indirect—of this activity.

The fact that the Army to-day has but a handful of airplanes and that the industry is practically nonexistent is attributed to the preponderance of experimental design activities. All of the experimental contracts are given out through McCook Field. Thus, if we are permitted time to examine expenditures carefully, it will appear that in addition to the \$20,000,000 direct cost the engineering division has cost many millions more, even approaching 50 per cent of all the money appropriated by Congress for the Army Air Service.

The tinkering of McCook Field engineers delays development of design by the industry and postpones, as it actually has in the case of the Thomas-Morse pursuit plane, actual production for several years or until the model itself is practically obsolete.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. REID of Illinois. May I have five minutes more?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I wish to speak in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I wish to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of Illinois. It is stated that the field offered to the War Department for the "greater McCook" station was purchased at a cost of \$400,000, through public subscription, at Dayton.

Who were the contributors to this fund?

Who were the owners of the land?

Should we not suspend this item until we are able to obtain a list of subscribers?

And then when we get this list it will be interesting to learn whether among these names will be found those persons, corporations, or interests who made money out of aircraft orders during the war, who expect to make money out of the business in the future, or who expect to profit through real-estate development.

As of December 31, 1923, there were 1,824 civilians employed at McCook Field and Wilbur Wright Field.

As of the same date the Navy aircraft factory and naval repair station at Pensacola employed 2,008 civilians.

Here is a total of 3,832 civilians engaged in governmental experimental engineering, manufacture, and repair.

At the same date there were employed in all the aircraft plants of the country only a total of not more than 1,500 persons.

In other words, the War Department and the Navy Department, while asking Congress for appropriations to procure aircraft from the industry, dissipate the money appropriated in tinkering or in trying to go into the aircraft business themselves.

ARMY HAS STOPPED ALL DESIGNING AT M'COOK FIELD, IT SAYS, SO WHY IS A LARGER FIELD NEEDED?

In his testimony before the House Aircraft Investigating Committee General Patrick stated:

When I became the head of the Army Air Service, I stopped designing and manufacture at McCook Field. Under ordinary methods of procedure we, in the procurement of material or equipment, merely asked for bids for building aircraft according to certain designs. I found that there was a great deal of designing being done at my engineering division; that this was in the way of throttling private enterprise, for outside designers felt that the Government would probably give preference to its own designs for one thing; that we would not look sympathetically upon designs made by others; and, as is always the case when the Government comes into competition with private enterprise, that private enterprise would either suffer severely or have to withdraw altogether. So I stopped designing at McCook Field.

DAYTON WANTS AN ENLARGED AIR SERVICE EXPERIMENTAL STATION FOR THE MONEY IT WILL BRING INTO THE CITY.

There is published in Dayton a magazine called *Shipstream*, which the editor avows to be "the only asserting voice of McCook Field and Dayton." In the June, 1924, edition, page 6, there is printed the following statement, showing that in return for the original "contribution" of about \$400,000, representing the purchase cost of the land offered to the Government, the city of Dayton expects to realize the sum of \$10,000,000, an actual pay roll of \$2,000,000 to \$5,000,000, and to provide employment for 3,000 to 5,000 skilled workmen. Note in the following quotation that even now the present "inadequate" McCook Field has the fourth largest pay roll in the city:

At the present time the architects are still busily engaged in mapping out plans of buildings and construction work in connection with

the proposed new home of the engineering division. Tentative plans, linked with the proposed sale of the five abandoned air fields, will aggregate a sum of \$10,000,000 for the purpose of erecting permanent buildings. The expansion made possible by the move will mean an annual pay roll of from \$2,000,000 to \$5,000,000 (McCook Field now has the fourth largest pay roll in Dayton). It will give employment to from 3,000 to 5,000 skilled workmen. It will mean the building of hundreds of new homes. It will give Dayton further world-wide publicity. It will increase Dayton's population many thousands. It will furnish a fitting memorial to the Wright brothers. It may result in the location here of an air academy surpassing the West Point and Annapolis institutions. It will advance the educational opportunities and standards of the community. It will focus the attention of the world upon Dayton's activities. It will attract the manufacturer of aircraft. It will draw thousands of desirable visitors. It will add to Dayton's reputation as a precision center. It will be splendid evidence of the progress and patriotism of Dayton people.

In the quotation just read there is a hint of the real-estate value which the construction of this \$10,000,000 Government industry will create in Dayton. Startling confirmation of this viewpoint is provided in the December issue of *Shipstream*, where it is editorially stated in an article discussing "Wright View Heights":

Naturally, since McCook Field is now assured for Dayton, a brisk real-estate development has sprung up about this "greatest flying field in the world."

On the same page there is a large advertisement of a real-estate development designated as Wright View Heights, and in this advertisement the following statement is made:

The acceptance by the Government of the new flying field was an epoch-making event in the industrial life of the city, and its completion in the near future will make Wright View Heights, which is located immediately adjacent to the new flying field, one of the finest home locations, as well as one of the safest, soundest, and sanest realty investments in the aviation district.

You will note that the people of Dayton, having invested \$400,000 in a "patriotic enterprise," are already counting the millions that they will receive in return, having assumed that because tentative indorsement by the War Department has been reported, that the Government of the United States has indorsed this amazing project.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, may I have two minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. ANTHONY. There will be no objection this time, but I hope the gentleman will not desire more time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COMPARISON OF LOCATION OF PRESENT AND PROPOSED M'COOK FIELDS

Mr. REID of Illinois. The present McCook Field comprises about 50 or 60 acres of leased ground in what is now the heart of the city of Dayton. This station was established at Dayton during the war with Germany at a rental, I understand, of around \$12,000 a year. Since then the rental has been steadily increased until it is now \$60,000 a year, and the Government's lease is good only from one year to another, with what appears to be a view to forcing the Government out of its present quarters to help Dayton's development.

The land which the patriotic citizens of Dayton, at a cost to themselves of about \$400,000, have offered to the War Department for a greater McCook Field, comprises about 525 acres on the Mad River, and is located near the present Wilbur Wright Field at Fairfield, Ohio, some 6 or 8 miles from the center of Dayton. It is absolutely unimproved. It is located partly in the Miami Valley conservancy project, and unless large sums of money are spent upon this "gift" it will be unsuitable for even ordinary flying, let alone the test flights which the Army must properly make at an experimental station.

AN INLAND EXPERIMENTAL STATION CONTRARY TO THE DEMAND OF EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY FOR COORDINATION OF LAND AND WATER FLYING

In his testimony before the House Aircraft Investigating Committee, January 5, General Patrick, in stating that McCook Field did not duplicate naval experimental activities in one feature, commented on the lack of a "sea" upon which the Army could test seaplanes or water-flying craft at Dayton.

Under the existing law the War Department is charged with the responsibility for the coast defense of the United States. More and more, as has been indicated in testimony of Army

and Navy officers before the committees of this House, it is apparent that the defense of the enormous coast line of our country rests now and must continue to rest, to an increasing degree, in the future upon our air force.

An experimental station for the Air Service should be so located that its operation, including experimental flying, should be made as near its base of action in national emergency as possible. To develop and test airplanes for coast defense at an inland station, located hundreds of miles from any deep water, is ridiculous, regardless of the demand of a small town for its real-estate development. The question as to whether future coast defense military planes will alight and land on the water is entirely beside the point. When the Air Service endeavored and carried on its experimentation in bombing naval vessels, it was forced to move all of its experimental material to Langley Field in order to operate in the action off Cape Henry.

DAYTON, OHIO, IS NOT ADAPTED TO EXPERIMENTAL FLYING AND TESTING EXCEPTING FOR A FEW MONTHS IN THE YEAR

Aircraft development, to reach its maximum efficiency, must be controlled by continual 365 day's flying conditions.

A citizen of Dayton will tell you that there is flying in Dayton every day of the year. So is there flying across the entire breadth of this continent every day in the Air Mail Service, but this does not indicate that conditions for experimental work are continually satisfactory throughout our broad country.

On November 24, 1924, at the invitation of the Air Service, various aircraft constructors sent their machines to McCook Field, three in number, to compete in flying performance for the purpose of the selection by the service of that corps observation plane best fitted to supplant the war-used DeHavillands. To thoroughly test an airplane in a competition such as this, the manufacturer must not only furnish his machine, but his engineers, mechanics, and operators. The Wright Co., the Curtiss Co., the Douglass Co. were represented on the job at Dayton. This is January 7, 1925, and these tests have not yet been completed. The reason is not lack of efficiency on the part of the service, or readiness on the part of the contestants or machines, but weather conditions were continually unfavorable. Deluge of rain day after day, turning the surrounding country into a morass, low-lying clouds preventing a plane from flying more than a few hundred feet in height, actual fog and mist. The money spent by these manufacturers, the time wasted by this large experimental division under the pay of the Government, and the general delay to our air development resulting in the failure of the Air Service to contract for its equipment under moneys realized July 1, 1924, is convincing evidence of the disadvantages of Dayton as a center for engineering operations.

This appropriation and the removal of the McCook Field will not only cost many millions of dollars without aiding the national defense, but will do more to prevent the unification of the Air Services than any other thing. Good judgment would dictate that it would be much better for the national security to have several smaller repair and testing stations in different parts of our country than merely one large one. And the Government now owns excellent fields in different parts of the country, Langley Field, Kelly Field, Rantoul Field, Mitchel Field, and on the Pacific coast, Aberdeen.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to the gentleman's amendment. If the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FITZGERALD] wishes to speak now, I will withdraw my amendment, but I would like to have it considered as pending.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, whether the last speaker [Mr. REID of Illinois] knows it or not, the attack he has just made against the research work of the Air Service is really a blow at the national defense. More and more the people of this country are coming to realize the great lesson that was taught in the World War. The airplane was invented at Dayton on this very field which the people of Dayton have bought at great expense and given free to the Government, without any condition, as a memorial to her distinguished citizens, Wilbur and Orville Wright. The airplane invented on this field and tested on this very field by the Wright brothers in 1904 found little interest on the part of the American people. The Wright brothers had to take it

to France to find appreciation and reward for their conquest of the air. Aerial navigation, besides its immeasurable commercial possibilities, was an addition to the fighting forces of the world. It was developed abroad, and when we got into the World War we had nothing in this country. Although Congress appropriated over a billion dollars for aircraft during the war, we never got one fighting plane on the front in France.

Now, I know that the good Congressman from Illinois who has just spoken agrees with me on fundamental things. I know, however, that he has a wrong understanding of the situation. I have not only visited every department of this experimental division of the Air Service of the Army, but I have taken instruction under the greatest engineer we have had in connection with the Army Air Service and in the work that is being carried on at McCook Field. I know that that work has resulted in the saving of countless lives in the Air Service. The lives of 8 per cent of the boys in the Air Service go out every year. It is true that they have a right, like other officers of the Army, to retire in 30 years, but they have to be dead more than twice over on an average before they can retire. At McCook Field every part of an airplane, every new design, every improvement or modification is tested by the cleverest mechanical devices to disclose weakness under stress, and yet the ultimate test in actual flight must be made by our air pilots, as courageous and noble a class of men as can be found in the world.

My friend from Illinois says that nothing has been invented there. This is not an asylum for prospective inventors. It is a place for testing out every legitimate idea that any man thinks he has tending to the advancement of aerial navigation; a place where any man with a new project relating to the construction of plane or engine can present it to the expert engineers of the Air Service to be tested and, if of promising value, developed and perfected, and there we should have and do have, to a large extent, the equipment that is necessary to find out whether or not there is anything in the idea, and if there is, develop it; and we have developed the supercharger, which permits the airplane to rise to unprecedented heights, the ground inductor compass, the most accurate bombing sights, as well as engines and other parts.

Mr. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. REID of Illinois. Do you say the McCook Field invented the supercharger?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; but they have thrown out those things which are dangerous, and have selected those things which are safe. The mariner's compass, invented by the Chinese, remained scarcely unimproved from the days of Columbus, when he crossed the Atlantic; the compass used by our own ships up to our own day saw no radical improvement, but the Air Service has developed a compass which can be used to keep an airship on its original course, through cloud and mist and storm to its destination, with due allowance made for drift by currents of the air. The stress on the structures of these different planes, the biplane and all-metal plane, and all these devices that make for the increased safety of our men and the advancement of aerial navigation were in large measure perfected at this field.

Let us see something about what the Dayton people have done. They have been attacked. Of course, their advantage has been appealed to, to get them to put that \$400,000 for this ground.

It is not 525 acres they have, as my good friend has said; it is nearly 5,000 acres.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. Will my good friend tell us what is proposed to be done? I can read pretty well but I do not quite understand. I thought we were going to stay on McCook Field.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We are not, and that is the point I want to reach. As to the attack made on the Dayton people, they are as human as anyone else. The Wright brothers lived and worked there. The people of Dayton have been attacked by my good friend from Illinois because they ignored the Wright brothers, but let me say to my good friend that the Dayton people were no different than the people of the rest of America—all looked upon the Wright brothers as visionaries.

Mr. REID of Illinois. Did not the Wright brothers have to go to Europe with their invention?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have already said that. The Dayton people are as ashamed of it as all the American people should be ashamed of it. They are ashamed of the fact that we not only let the airplane but the machine gun, invented in America, and the submarine, invented in America, be developed by foreign powers, to our great disadvantage, our enormous loss of life, and our enormous financial loss.

Now the proposition is this: McCook Field, as now situated, was located during the war. It is within the city of Dayton. It has, as my good friend from Illinois has said, something less than 225 acres of land in the flying field. It is dangerously small. The surroundings make it additionally dangerous.

Because it is so small at least five lives have been lost in landing on or taking off from that field. It is an airport on the airway across the country where the planes have to stop on their way from Washington west, and the field is used for that purpose, but the field is so small and so shaped that it is not adequate. It is dangerous. Now, what was to be done? The Dayton people were interested, naturally, in retaining it. It is a very advantageous thing, as my good friend says. It is advantageous in a commercial way. It was not established at Dayton as a matter of sentiment, but it was established at Dayton because it is a center for the highest grade of mechanics in the country. There is at Dayton the National Cash Register Co., one of the greatest institutions in the world, employing on its instruments of precision the very highest grade of mechanics. The Recording & Computing Machine Co. has its factory there. The Ohmer Fare Register Co., which manufactures the registering machines used in taxicabs, and other registering devices, have their shops at Dayton, so that the institution at McCook Field is in a position to get the kind of help they need, a kind of help which you can not get at other places.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I would like to finish this statement and I will yield in a moment. The field is a rented field. It belongs to the General Motors Corporation and it costs \$60,000 a year in rent. It has no railroad facilities; it costs thousands of dollars to haul gasoline and other supplies to this field. Now, the Dayton people went down into their pockets, as a monument and tribute to the Wright brothers, and as a realization and repentance of their neglect, and of the neglect of American people, and put up over \$400,000, not to buy 525 acres, as my friend says, but almost 5,000 acres of ground.

They gave that ground to the Government and it is near this location. In moving this field the Government will save \$500,000, because it can be moved so much cheaper to this new location than it can to any other location. This great new field, the largest in the world, is sufficient for all purposes, even bombing experiments. It has high ground, low ground, and great stretches of level ground. A great sheet of water could be impounded there from the Mad River if it were necessary and if they wanted to test the landing gears on naval planes there. It is in every way adequate. It is the greatest aviation field in the world, and comes to the United States as a tribute of the Dayton people to the Wright brothers and as an expression of patriotism. The Government needs to locate this great and advantageous branch of the national defense on this new site so that men will not be killed in attempting to land on a small and inadequate field, and the Government will be saved \$132,500 a year if it will just take possession of this field, move its buildings over there and occupy them. This ought to be an appropriation of \$1,500,000 so they can erect their buildings promptly, because the \$500,000 provided in this bill will only enable them to put in the foundations.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Permit me to ask the gentleman whether he has considered the likelihood of a combined force of the Army and the Navy within a few years?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have indeed, sir.

Mr. BUTLER. We have had some hearings before the Committee on Naval Affairs with reference to that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And I have attended your committee hearings for that very purpose.

Mr. BUTLER. I know the gentleman attended them. Now, is my friend of the opinion that this place will be feasible if that should occur?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Absolutely. I could discuss that and would be very glad to do so, because I am one of those who, like my friend from New York, believes in a united air service.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. KETCHAM. The gentleman just made reference to the fact that the appropriation ought to be \$1,500,000 instead of \$500,000 for the purpose of erecting buildings. Will the gentleman give the committee the benefit of his judgment as to what the whole building program will involve if the whole scheme works out in accordance with his own views or the views of those well informed upon the subject?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BEGG). The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. My good friend from Illinois suggested \$10,000,000. I am hopeful that will be true, when it is realized that one first-class battleship, without its equipment, cost \$30,000,000, and it has been demonstrated that there is not a ship built or which can be built for the sea that can survive against airplane attack.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. KETCHAM. Some reference was made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REID] to the fact that we had other experimental fields in the United States. Will the gentleman kindly inform the committee what he knows about that?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is true. The Navy experiments and other branches of the Government, too; for instance, the Postal Service, in a small way. They do make some experiments as to their special needs. But this is the central research branch for both the Navy and the Army. The Navy is independent and there is a certain amount of emulation and competition between these departments, and at Philadelphia the Navy does experiment on these things. However, they exchange knowledge. I have not heard of an instance where they have withheld from each other the value of these things. While McCook Field is not properly equipped for research work, nevertheless it is the best in the world to-day. It needs the expenditure of \$300,000 for propeller-test equipment alone, because as the result of such propeller tests we shall save many thousands of dollars, we will save the lives of many of our men, and we shall more surely and rapidly advance the safety and efficiency of the navigation of the air.

Mr. KETCHAM. Referring to this large number of experimental stations—

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is not a large number. There are only two that amount to anything at all.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman give his opinion with reference to the advisability of concentrating it all in one place?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will say in reply, first, I am strongly in favor of the reorganization of all the departments of our Government. I feel we ought to have one department of national defense, where the Air Service ought to get its full participation and be given its full importance. There ought to be a bureau for the Navy and a bureau for the Army and a bureau as well for the Air Service. I say to you I am strongly in favor of coordination of all these matters, but we can not control matters of invention and matters of experiment which go on formally and informally in the minds of every ingenious youth in America who becomes interested in radio or other appliances, and from the most unlearned we sometimes get the most splendid inventions.

It has been said in one of our technical magazines recently that no engineer of any importance in the United States has invented a thing of any value recently, but that all such inventions have come from the amateurs, especially is this true in radio. McCook Field is the place where all of things pertaining to aircraft are tested out and their value ascertained. No expenditures in manufacturing enterprises in America to-day yield higher returns than those in well-directed research and experimental work such as is carried in the interests of the national defense and commercial aviation at McCook Field.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WATKINS. What do the experts have to say upon this proposition the gentleman is talking about?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio may proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATKINS. What have the experts to say upon this proposition the gentleman is talking about?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The experts want \$1,500,000 for this work. This \$500,000 set forth in this bill is in keeping with this situation. The Budget Bureau has ordered that all estimates or demands for appropriations for the activities of the War Department to be cut down in compliance with our national policy of rigid economy in all branches of Government. The department distributed this required reduction in estimates. And in order to avoid contention and keep everybody as satisfied as possible in all branches of the service, reductions were in every branch of the service.

This is one branch of our national defense in which I am convinced there should have been no cut. This is the most economical form of national defense we have. This item has been cut in accordance with this policy, but it ought to be \$1,500,000, and I will tell you why it would be more economical for the country if this Congress made this item \$1,500,000 than to keep it at \$500,000.

By appropriating but \$500,000 when we should appropriate \$1,500,000, which is required to make the transfer, it is as if you were to rent another house or build another house than your own home and then would apportion so much to pay the first moving van in one month or in one week to move part of your furniture out of your living room or out of one of your bedrooms over to the new house and then string it out over a considerable period of time. Every year of delay in moving to the new site will cost the United States more than \$132,000; and money is not all, as I have indicated.

Mr. REID of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield? If you are going to move to another house and you are taking your mother-in-law with you, would you build the same kind of a house?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I would not do that myself. [Laughter.]

Mr. REID of Illinois. Is it not true there are more than one or two other places where they have experimental work in designing?

Mr. FITZGERALD. You have correctly stated they do not want to do any designing at this field because of the contentions of private manufacturers. I say to you, and you know very well, that General Patrick wants to encourage commercial aviation development everywhere. The Government has used every ingenuity to encourage it. I know that you and I differ about the proper methods.

Mr. REID of Illinois. I do not differ from you. We are going to the same place, only by a different route. I am in favor of a unified service, and if we ever vote for this appropriation we will never get it. You know the Army never lets go of anything it once gets its hands on.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is a prophecy, but I prophesy quite differently. Time will show which is correct.

Mr. REID of Illinois. Do you know that we have not a single all-metal airplane in the United States?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; I do, and I am very glad to say that I do know that, and I will tell you why. This whole art is in a condition of flux. The experiments which are being made—

Mr. REID of Illinois. If the art is changing every day, will the gentleman tell the committee why General Patrick told the Committee on Appropriations he had contracted for ships for three years ahead because they had become so standardized?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I understand he is doing that, and I would like for my good friend to realize that we must keep up a certain amount of instant preparation for an emergency, but we must not squander money in building great fleets of airships of one type or the other. There are five different main types, as you know. We must not squander millions of dollars in building those types which may be obsolete in a year or two on account of the perfecting of the general designs, and of wings, engines, and other parts.

The gentleman must know that if the Almen barrel-type engine, which is being developed at the McCook Field, is perfected and can be run at high speed and of a size to develop high power as successfully as it can already at low speed, it means the revolutionizing of all the airplanes of the world. In the meantime a regard for the safety of American institutions and the insurance of our great material wealth and prosperity call for at least the number of planes at once as General Patrick has contracted for.

Mr. REID of Illinois. The McCook Field is an "if" field. They have never accomplished a single thing.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman is not fair. It has saved the lives of countless aviators already.

Mr. REID of Illinois. How?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Because they have perfected and corrected a number of weaknesses in the structure of the planes.

Mr. REID of Illinois. Does the gentleman know they were forced to take on the parachutes over their protest?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; they were not.

Mr. REID of Illinois. General Patrick testified to that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I happened to be there myself, and the gentleman will find one of those parachutes with my name and number on it, because I have flown back and forth from here a number of times.

Mr. REID of Illinois. The gentleman stated there was no other place where they did experimental work.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Quite the contrary, they are experimenting everywhere in the world where planes are flown.

Mr. REID of Illinois. I mean under the control of the Government. Do you know what the National Advisory Board on Aeronautics is doing?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; and I also know what the Bureau of Standards is doing. They are working on these matters also.

Mr. REID of Illinois. And is not the Navy experimenting also?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. REID of Illinois. What are they experimenting on?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They are experimenting on everything that comes within the observation of any one of these men, but when it comes to the expenditure of any considerable sum of money there is no great appropriation for it.

Mr. REID of Illinois. Can you say there is no duplication?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Very little.

Mr. REID of Illinois. You heard General Mitchell's statement which I read in the RECORD this morning.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, yes; and I am quite familiar with General Mitchell's ideas, and if you want General Mitchell's statement I will bring it to the members of this committee to the effect that the appropriation for McCook Field ought to be increased to \$10,000,000. Does the gentleman suggest I can not get General Mitchell to come before his committee, or any committee, and explain to them that this is necessary and ought to be done in the interest of ultimate economy and for the national defense? I would be very glad to do that.

Mr. REID of Illinois. General Mitchell has been before our committee.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let me add, I am one of those who gave to the fund to purchase this new site for the Government, and to the best of my knowledge and belief no contributor to the fund has any financial interest in any company building airplanes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment pending.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BEGG). The gentleman from New York has an amendment pending, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. LAGUARDIA to the amendment offered by Mr. REID of Illinois: Page 37, line 1, after the word "aircraft," strike out "\$14,700,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$14,200,000"; and after the word "herein," line 11, page 38, strike out the remainder of the line, and all of lines 12 to 25, both inclusive, on said page; on line 1, page 39, strike out the words "owned in fee simple by the United States."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, my amendment perfects the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois and takes out \$500,000 which he seeks to strike out from the total amount. I fear that we are a little bit confused here, resulting from the inquiry which was made by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WATKINS], and the reply that he received from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FITZGERALD]. First of all, the committee must know that we have an experimental station at McCook's Field, Dayton, Ohio, and that this amendment does not contemplate discontinuing that station. The experimental work will continue at McCook's Field. This morning I read into the RECORD the testimony of General Patrick and the testimony of Admiral Moffett showing that neither of these gentlemen knew what the other was doing. The appropriation now before us is sufficient to carry on the experimental work at McCook's Field which the gentleman said was so necessary. What the provision in the bill seeks to do is to build a new station at Dayton on land given to the Government by the citizens of Dayton. The \$500,000 is to move the equipment, build roads, and lay some of the foundations, nothing else. The plan submitted by General Patrick contemplated the ex-

penditure of \$4,000,000, according to his testimony, but it will be nearer \$10,000,000 than \$4,000,000.

We do not want to decide the merits of this transfer at this time before we work out the problem of aviation. The gentleman from Illinois is on the special committee of the House and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PERKINS] will agree, I am sure, with my amendment to strike out the transfer at this time and not start a project of \$10,000,000 when perhaps next year we will decide that it is not necessary. That is all we are asking.

I want to say to the gentleman from Ohio that we are not against the project, but we ask to put it off until the major problems of aviation are settled. We demonstrated this morning that some of the work that is being done at McCook Field is done at the aircraft factory in Philadelphia. The distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] expressed his opinion the other day that he believed we ought to unify the aviation activities, and the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], chairman of the Naval Committee, often has expressed the same view, and a few days ago General Patrick so testified.

We are arriving at a point where we are going to get some good results on this big problem, and it would be foolish to enter upon this project now. If McCook Field is improper and unsafe, as somebody has testified, those responsible for transferring it there from Langley Field in 1918 should answer. We had exactly the same proposition in the Sixty-sixth Congress in the second session on the 11th and 12th of December, 1919. It was then a different company—it was the Moraine Development Co. wanted to sell land for \$800 an acre; and I showed that the assessed value was \$85 an acre. If I had time, I would like to read what Mr. Mann said, who took the floor and supported my amendment. The appropriation was stricken out. The proposition then urged upon us was that if we did not buy the Moraine Development Co. property, the station would be discontinued. No such thing happened. The McCook Field has been functioning for years, and now they come with the same idea for another piece of land. I do not want to prejudice this case, but we will decide it on its merits next year. Give us an opportunity before we appropriate more money, and then have it charged to aviation, although it goes for land.

On the same day we acquired another piece of property—the Curtiss Elmwood plant, of which I spoke earlier in the day—for which we paid \$1,400,000. It was said that it was essential. The property was afterwards sold, two years later, for \$700,000. That was charged up to aviation, and yet you wonder why we have not got anything to show for the money we appropriate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Now, gentlemen, I hope you will not be swept off your feet with any idea that any work at Dayton is going to be discontinued. The appropriation bill carries the usual allowance for McCook Field. This \$500,000 has nothing to do with it. The work will be carried on at McCook Field the same as all the work will be carried on in Philadelphia, which was appropriated for the other day. There is no hurry at all about transferring the equipment and starting building roads and spurs at the new field. What is going to happen if you appropriate this. If they start building roads and foundations, if we afterwards have a unified service, and production under it is unified, we may find that this is not necessary. Then there will be a waste of an additional million dollars and nothing to show for it.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I will.

Mr. WATKINS. Does not the gentleman think that the Secretary of War would take care of that in view of this language:

Provided, That such a site satisfactory to the Secretary of War and on terms approved by him is provided for this purpose without cost to the Government.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. There are no buildings on that. We are entering upon a project involving \$10,000,000. The land is not going to run away. They have been trying to give us land since the Sixty-sixth Congress. I hope, for the sake of the success of aviation in this country, that you will start to-day and strike this item out, and give us a chance to get together and come here with a comprehensive plan, something constructive, something definite and final.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment just offered. I think that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] who offered it will agree that he has inadvertently made an error in writing the latter part of his amendment. The language which he desires to change at the bottom of the page 38 reads as follows:

And provided further, That no part of said sum of \$500,000 shall be expended for buildings or improvements on land not owned in fee simple by the United States.

If the gentleman's amendment were adopted, then the sentence would read this way:

And provided further, That no part of said sum of \$500,000 shall be expended for buildings or improvements on lands not.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Oh, no; I have proposed to strike out everything on page 38 after line 11.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I have read the amendment three times, and I fail to understand why my construction is not correct.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I have proposed to strike out on page 38, after line 11, everything after the word "herein" and all of lines 25, both inclusive, and the words on line 1, page 39.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I now understand. The gentleman is correct. But, Mr. Chairman, in respect to the situation at Dayton, as I saw it, when the matter came before the subcommittee on appropriations, the President sent the bill over from the Director of the Budget to the Congress providing for \$500,000 to be expended for the erection of buildings on the donated land, and added a provision that none of the money should be expended upon land not owned by the United States. Then the question arose as to what the word "owned" meant. Inquiry developed the fact that the conveyance of the body of land which has been presented to the United States by the people of Dayton contained a proviso that when the United States Government ceased to use it for airplane purposes that it should revert.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I would rather proceed a minute first.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I merely want to set the gentleman right and state that the minute that proposition was raised it was submitted to the donors, and they said that they would waive even that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. If the gentleman had possessed himself in patience for a half minute I would have made that statement myself. As I was saying, the question arose as to what might be meant by the word "owned." I took the position, and so did the rest of the committee, that a serious question might arise as to how long the United States might own the property. As has been said here, we are paying \$68,000 a year for the flying field, which is in the suburbs of Dayton. As said, these several thousand acres of land were donated with the proviso that whenever the land ceases to be used as a flying field, then the land should revert. The position taken was that sewers and underground electric-light wires and underground water pipes and such items, including buildings, would of necessity have to be built on the land. Then if Congress at some future time, perhaps at some early time in the future, discontinued that as a flying field, the donors of that land would get the millions of dollars free of charge that the Government put into the sewers and these underground ways for light and water and various other things which would have to go with a great flying field like that. Then, in order to have no question as to what the word "owned" meant, the committee got into communication with the donors at Dayton and asked them whether they would be willing to give to the Government a fee-simple title, so that when the Government did spend its millions of dollars for sewers, light, and electricity, and all those things, it would still be the property of the United States; and, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FITZGERALD] has said, the donors of that land have acceded to it. So that if we accept the land now it becomes the property of the United States, and all the money spent upon it will be for the benefit of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that his time be extended for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. REID of Illinois. Would the gentleman tell the committee whether or not the United States Government has actually the deed in fee simple for the property at the present time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I can not answer that question certainly, but I can say that the chairman of the subcommittee

has said that such is the case, and I have not the slightest reason to doubt it. If the title has not been completed, I believe it will be perfected before this bill becomes law, and, further, if the bill is left just as the committee has written it, the \$500,000 can not be spent on the donated land until a fee-simple deed has been made to the United States.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the gentleman tell us what is the value of this new field now?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I do not know, but I understand it is valuable land.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. It is filled-in land.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, answering the question of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REID], I had a telegram from Mr. Patterson, of Dayton, who is the president of the association, that a deed in fee simple would be forwarded at once to the War Department.

Mr. REID of Illinois. The gentleman does not know whether it has been or not?

Mr. ANTHONY. I have only his statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. If it is not done, then these buildings can not be erected upon it.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time the committee has been placed in the attitude of defending an appropriation for the experimental and development plant at Dayton. The committee desires to say to the House that there is no question that we absolutely need the continuance of this experimental and development plant at Dayton. It is absolutely essential to the successful operation of the Air Service, and, as numerous gentlemen have said on the floor of the House here, the plant at Dayton is not concerned with the production of new engines or new planes, but is concerned with the testing of every airplane engine and of every new airplane appliance and every new airplane that is brought out by any inventor or manufacturer in this country, to see whether it is adapted to the use of the military service.

The money we appropriate here is expended for that purpose, and in my opinion it is an absolutely correct statement that the work done there has been of inestimable value to the whole airplane science and industry in the way of detecting unsuitable inventions and appliances and in saving the Army from the expenditure of millions of dollars that would have been the case had they adopted a plane unsuitable to the service. Now, the situation in regard to airplane—

Mr. REID of Illinois. If the gentleman will yield there, the gentleman says it will save them from buying planes unsuitable for the service. Does not the gentleman know as a matter of fact that General Patrick ordered 300 planes and the day after the purchase they had to discard them?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; and I stated on the floor the other day that practically all the money we had expended for new airplanes since the war up to the last year, from the standpoint of airplanes we should have had, has been wasted, and that is the reason this committee has refrained from recommending large appropriations to the House for new construction of airplanes, because the whole industry has been in a state of flux, and they have only now reached a point where they can safely go into such production.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. If the gentleman will yield, is it not true the gentleman has provided for McCook Field in this bill—

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; and there is this argument why McCook Field should be wiped out as soon as possible. As the gentleman has stated here, this is a comparatively small field, about 250 acres, located almost in the city of Dayton, in the midst of houses, manufactories, telephone and telegraph wires, and all kinds of obstructions, and the flyers take their lives in their hands whenever they attempt to make a difficult landing there under the adverse conditions which exist.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The field has been there since 1917.

Mr. ANTHONY. The buildings are largely constructed of wood, as the gentleman knows, subject to fire hazard at all times, and I think that every element that can be taken into consideration demands that the McCook Field plant be moved to some permanent location where we can have permanent buildings and where the Air Service can have suitable facilities for the operation of the plant; and that is just what the committee is trying to do in the recommendation it makes in this bill. We are offered a site in Dayton of 4,500 acres of land, which all the experts say is excellently adapted to the purpose, and it comes to the Government with a fee-simple title. The proposition involves an expenditure of \$500,000 on a plant costing, not \$10,000,000, as the gentleman from New York says, but which we are assured can be moved and constructed at a cost not exceeding \$4,000,000.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. How much of the land would be under water in the event of a flood again?

Mr. ANTHONY. I doubt that very much would be.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Some would.

Mr. ANTHONY. That would be all right; if it was for a very few weeks in the spring it would not interfere.

Mr. WATKINS. If the gentleman will yield, what is the reasonable value of that land?

Mr. ANTHONY. In this district?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. I have no knowledge of the value of the land. Back in 1919, alluded to by the gentleman from New York—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WATKINS. I ask that the gentleman have two more minutes.

Mr. ANTHONY. I ask for five minutes additional.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ANTHONY. I want to say to the House now, while the House rejected the proposition of acquiring the plant of the Dayton-Wright Co. for its permanent development and experimental plant, I think the United States Government lost two or three million dollars by not accepting the offer of the Dayton-Wright people at that time. If it had accepted that offer it would now have a permanent home for its experimental and development plant at a cost less than half what it will have to spend now.

Mr. REID of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will.

Mr. REID of Illinois. Is it not true when the Army wanted to conduct the experiments in reference to the bombing of the ships that they had to move the material to Langley Field?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes, because of the geographic situation; manifestly they could not fly their planes from Dayton to the Chesapeake Bay.

Mr. REID of Illinois. Is there anything peculiar about Dayton, is it a better airplane area than any other place anywhere?

Mr. ANTHONY. There is a great advantage in being able to secure skilled labor. It is right in the center of the highest type of skilled mechanics.

Mr. REID of Illinois. The United States Government owns Selfridge Field?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. REID of Illinois. Is not there a lot of skilled labor there?

Mr. ANTHONY. That is not a mechanical plant, it is a flying field. But Dayton is near the center of the country, and, as one gentleman said, there is a flying atmosphere and a closer historical association at Dayton than any other field.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. And there is an unpleasant recollection in reference to Dayton, too.

Mr. REID of Illinois. How does the gentleman account for the fact there were three planes at Dayton on November 24 for a test of flying by a corps observation flight and they have not been able to get it? To-day is January 7, and that was November 24.

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not know anything about that. I think the House should accept the proposition outlined in this bill. I think it is in every way an advantage to the Government to do so, and whether we proceed this year we will have to go ahead next year with the construction of this experimental and development plant. Whether it is done under the united Air Service or under the service as it is now we will have to go ahead. If we have a united Air Service, there is no question but that the Army will have a major part in any such united Air Service, and would undoubtedly make the same recommendation to us next year for the building of this plant at Dayton as it does this year.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. The situation is about this, is it not? The present facilities are inadequate. What you are trying to do is to provide adequate facilities. This item requires in the language of the bill that the site acquired shall be satisfactory to the Secretary of War and shall be obtained on terms approved by him, and it is to be provided without cost to the Government?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; rather than accept it with strings to it, the committee endeavored to let the people of Dayton understand that it would be accepted only with a fee-simple title.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Does not the gentleman believe that prudent and careful legislation would require that we put this in abeyance for one year?

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not see anything that could be gained by that.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman from Kansas please tell us where the title to the McCook Field land rests?

Mr. ANTHONY. We have it under lease now, at a cost of over \$5,000 a month.

Mr. KETCHAM. Is there anything to be realized from the sale?

Mr. ANTHONY. Some old buildings there, worth practically nothing; but there is some very valuable machinery there, which would be transferred to the new site.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REID] made an amazing statement a little while ago when he said that practically all of the money that had been spent for aircraft had been wasted.

Mr. ANTHONY. That is true with respect to practically all the planes that are used by the Air Service to-day. In other words, all the planes hitherto made are put in what they call their second line.

Mr. BRIGGS. Are all the planes so far made obsolete?

Mr. ANTHONY. In the development of certain types the new planes that will be produced with the money carried in this bill will be so far ahead of any that we now have that the others would be placed in the second line.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas may have two minutes more, or five minutes if he desires it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRIGGS. What is the comparison between our efficiency in aircraft construction and aircraft generally with that of foreign nations?

Mr. ANTHONY. The committee went into that carefully, and the evidence produced at the hearings in the testimony of General Patrick and General Mitchell, who has just returned from an investigation of the foreign countries, shows that absolutely there is no question, as the result of his observations, that in the development of airplanes themselves we are way ahead of any other nation in the world. General Mitchell says as far as the efficiency of the personnel in this country is concerned we are also in splendid shape, and there is only one nation possibly that excels us in what he calls the tactical side, and that is the French.

Mr. BRIGGS. The newspapers the other day stated, I think quoting from General Patrick, that we should have 300 planes at least in our service. I believe he made that statement before the Aircraft Investigating Committee.

Mr. ANTHONY. Three hundred planes of the latest type. When all the planes that are provided for in this bill and under contract are completed in 1926 we shall have 1,256 planes.

Mr. BRIGGS. How many will be in the first line, as you might call it, instead of in the second class?

Mr. ANTHONY. There will be 366.

Mr. BRIGGS. Three hundred and sixty-six in the first line?

Mr. ANTHONY. In the first line. We understand that these planes that General Patrick puts in the second line are as good as those possessed by any other nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas may proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas may proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRIGGS. One other question. In what condition will this leave the United States with reference to its standing relatively in airplane efficiency as compared with other nations when this program is carried out?

Mr. ANTHONY. I still think we will be deficient as to numbers of planes, but as to the efficiency of the planes I think we will be ahead.

Mr. BRIGGS. How will we rank with other nations? Is it second or fourth?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think France to-day is first, and England is second, and this country is perhaps third in the number of airplanes and in the size of our service.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. The remarkable statement was made recently that 300 planes were made and promptly discarded. Let us hear about that.

Mr. ANTHONY. General Patrick alluded, I think, to the Thomas-Morse plane. That was a few years ago. It was a light pursuit plane. The committee was told at the time they made that Thomas-Morse plane that it was the very ultimate in fast pursuit planes, and that we ought to go into immediate production of them. But we see, as General Patrick said, that after the first year we get them, they go into the second line.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Are we following to-day the advice of the officer who advised the production of that plane two years ago?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think at that time the Thomas-Morse plane represented the ultimate.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The gentleman is in error about that. It never did represent the ultimate.

Mr. REID of Illinois. They are what are known as blind planes.

Mr. ANTHONY. I happened to be at the Dayton field when they flew the Thomas-Morse and other planes, and I remember a high officer pointing out this Thomas-Morse plane in the air, and he said, "There is the type we ought to adopt."

Mr. LA GUARDIA. May I ask whether or not he was a flying officer?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; I think he was a flying officer.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. Did not General Mitchell testify before the Committee on Aircraft that we were not only behind England and France but also Japan in the construction of airplanes?

Mr. ANTHONY. We are not behind Japan.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How are we as to the proportion of people killed, who were killed in the operation of aircraft?

Mr. ANTHONY. We have a less number of accidents per flying hour than any other nation. That has been carefully investigated and checked up. It is based on the number of flying hours per plane. The figures are interesting. For instance, it is shown that in 1923 military aviators in France suffered 59 fatal accidents and 78 deaths. The number of flying hours per fatal accident was 2,840, and the number of flying hours per death was 2,150. In Italy they had 12 fatal accidents and 12 deaths in 1923. The figures show that we have had a less number of fatal accidents per flying hour than any other country.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman knows that if we were situated like Great Britain or France, we would probably have two or three or four times as many planes as we have now.

Mr. ANTHONY. That is true.

Mr. BLANTON. We would need them then, but we do not need them as we are situated.

Mr. ANTHONY. That is true.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, with this three-cornered triangular fight that has been going on here all day between New York, Illinois, and Ohio, how does the gentleman ever hope to get our Air Service unified?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will tell the gentleman what I think. I think there is perhaps a little jealousy on the part of the airplane manufacturers of the country toward this experimental plant at Dayton.

Mr. BLANTON. I am not talking about the manufacturers, but I am talking about New York, Illinois, and Ohio.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Well, the gentleman wants to be fair. He knows we have no ground in and around New York that is adapted to anything like this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired. The question comes on the substitute offered for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question next comes on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANHAM: Page 39, line 23, after the word "thereof," insert "The provisions herein made with reference to helium for the acquisition of land or interest in land by purchase, lease, or condemnation where necessary to explore for, procure, or reserve helium gas, and also for the purchase, manufacture, construction, maintenance, and operation of plants for the production thereof and experimentation therewith, shall apply also to the Navy Department."

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I believe that an understanding of this amendment will obviate any objection to it, and for this reason I wish briefly to explain it. The helium project is operated on a 50-50 basis by the Army and the Navy. There are two problems in the helium project. One is the problem of the conservation of helium, and the other is the problem of current supply. By this amendment it is sought to make the provisions in this bill applicable also to the Navy Department, in view of the fact that the two departments are jointly interested in the development of this great project. It is thought, by newly discovered economies in the extraction of helium and the consequent reduction of cost that is foreseen, that likely it will be possible to save a part of the money here appropriated. That is the hope of those in control. If this can be done the adoption of this amendment will enable the two branches of the service, through this saving, to take some steps toward insuring an adequate current supply.

The field from which we are now getting our supply, that at Petrolia, Tex., 104 miles north of the city of Fort Worth, where we have our plant, is being considerably reduced. The indications are that it may be relatively a very short time until gas from that source will not be adequate for our current helium needs. The Government owns a pipe line from the city of Fort Worth to this Petrolia field. A new field has been discovered at Nocona, situated about 22 miles from this pipe line, bearing a gas with a slightly higher percentage of helium and less carbon dioxide, which has to be removed before the helium is extracted. For these reasons this gas seems quite available for production purposes, and it may be acquired, it is estimated, at a cost considerably less than we are now paying for the gas from which we get our helium. A constant current supply is menaced unless we take advantage of some such opportunity as is thus afforded, and here fortunately is a field close by to which a slight extension of our line will give us access.

The period of probable use of the available supply of this new field is estimated variously at from 10 to 25 years. In other words, this amendment, in view of the fact that the Army and the Navy operate the project on a 50-50 basis, is simply to lend facility in the operation. The amendment provides that the provisions herein contained shall apply also to the Navy Department in order that the two departments may have the same authority and work hand in hand for the better development of the project, and the economies contemplated in extraction may make it possible, if this amendment prevails, to use these provisions for increasing our source of current supply with the appropriations available.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Of course, in the Army bill we do not assume any jurisdiction over the affairs of the Navy. I would like to inquire whether the gentleman has talked to those interested in the Navy appropriation bill with reference to this matter.

Mr. LANHAM. I will say to the gentleman that I have taken this matter up with the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, with the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, and also with gentlemen on the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee having naval matters in charge. And with reference to a precedent for it there was a somewhat analogous provision concerning the Air Service of the Navy in the Army bill for the fiscal year of 1921.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REID of Illinois: Page 37, line 16, after the word "purchase" insert the words "from commercial aircraft manufacturing corporations in this country in which none of the stock is directly or indirectly held, owned, or controlled by foreigners"; and in line 17, after the word "accessories" insert the words "without advertising or competition."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. Mr. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment I referred to in my first series of remarks, and I want to recall your attention merely to the fact that the Army gives this contract to Fokker when the American industry is starving. This amendment provides that the United States Army shall buy its planes from American manufacturers. The other part of the amendment does away with competitive bidding, and I have given my reasons for that. I want to call your attention to the way this is handled by Great Britain.

According to General Mitchell of the United States Air Service, Great Britain is to-day the leading air power of the world, potentially.

This is due to the manner in which Great Britain has proceeded in the maintenance and expansion of its civilian aircraft industry.

The British Government, first of all, wrote up an "approved list" of constructors, not only of manufacturers of complete aircraft and engines, but of certain parts distinctly aeronautical, the manufacture of which upon a satisfactory scale was dependent upon research and design.

The requirements for getting on this approved list included engineering ability, financial responsibility, and adequate manufacturing facilities.

Only aircraft firms going to the fundamental expense of engineering and designing had a right to be regarded as a part of the basic aircraft industry and receive orders from the Government.

The British Government laid down the maxim that it was not a competitor of the aircraft industry in design, construction, or repair. Instead of hoarding aircraft repair jobs in Government plants as we do in this country, Great Britain gave them to the industry and thus supplied a regular flow of work through the plants. This flow of business, in turn, lowers the costs of production and engineering on new projects and makes war-time manufacturing always available.

The British Government established the principles of competition in design as an incentive to the development of the art and thus placed a primary definite value to civilian research and design.

The British Government formally recognized proprietary design rights of the firms on the approved list.

Although competition was properly required in the case of design, and consequently in very small experimental orders the British Government established and adhered to the principles of noncompetition in production orders and the allocation to firms on the approved list of orders for the material desired.

Surely our country should be able to devise some such system that will help the industry as well as aid the national defense.

I want to say a word more about Dayton. You can see that the Dayton idea was all right. They wanted to commemorate the name of Wright, and they felt really ashamed, so they tried to palm off a deed on the Government with a string to it. Up to date they have not delivered the deed.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Of course, the gentleman realizes that if they do not deliver the deed this legislation will not be effective.

Mr. REID of Illinois. I understand; but that does not keep me from doing my duty here in calling your attention to the Dayton system. The Dayton promoters are the best in the world. They not only have the cash-register business, that runs a great part of our country, but they will have the work of the United States Air Service down and Dayton up on account of the action you have taken to-day.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. REID of Illinois. No; I do not desire to be heard, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The sum of \$203,255.95 of the appropriation for the Air Service for the fiscal year 1923 contained in the "Act making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes," approved

June 30, 1922, shall remain available until June 30, 1926, for the payment of obligations incurred under contracts executed prior to July 1, 1923.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking the chairman of the subcommittee a question.

I am very much interested in the action that is contemplated with reference to the around-the-world flyers. I would like to ask the gentleman whether, in connection with the consideration of the appropriation bill or in the hearings leading up to its consideration, any thought was given or any hearings held covering that point.

Mr. ANTHONY. I suppose the gentleman refers to the matter of reward for these world flyers?

Mr. KETCHAM. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. That would involve new legislation, and of course any legislation would have to come out of the Military Affairs Committee. I would like to say a word on that matter in answer to the gentleman, if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. KETCHAM. I will be pleased to hear the gentleman.

Mr. ANTHONY. These men did a very wonderful feat, but it has always occurred to me that there are 500 other officers in the Air Service who if they had had the opportunity could have perhaps performed it just as well and just as efficiently, and for one I am in hopes no such reward will be given these successful flyers as will take away anything that belongs to their colleagues and brothers in arms, such as undue promotion would. I think the reward should come in the form of recognition at the hands of Congress and some substantial recognition.

Mr. KETCHAM. I would say to the chairman that the interest I have is that one of these men happens to come from the congressional district which I have the honor to represent, and, naturally, I have a very great interest in anything that relates to a proper recognition of their fine accomplishment. In that connection I was sorry that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] the other day should attempt to detract in any way from their glory by a rather critical reference. Certainly it was a wonderful accomplishment when judged from any standpoint, and I regretted that very much.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. Very gladly.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman did not reflect upon these flyers.

Mr. KETCHAM. I not only heard the gentleman but also read the Record with considerable care.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman will not find any reflection upon them at all. I was only reflecting upon the fact that even the members of the Committee on Appropriations did not know anything at all about what the expense of the flight was, and I stated that they ought to keep up with such things and be able to tell us when we asked such questions.

Mr. BARBOUR. It was clearly demonstrated at that time that the Committee on Appropriations did know what was being done.

Mr. BLANTON. I was speaking solely upon the question of expenses and made no reflection upon them at all.

Mr. KETCHAM. Then do I understand that the gentleman greatly admires what they did? And his criticism was not directed to them, but to the money spent?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly, I do. The gentleman himself does not admire what they did any more than I do.

Mr. KETCHAM. Then I will very gladly withdraw the observation I made.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF AIR SERVICE

Salaries: For personal services in the District of Columbia in accordance with "The classification act of 1923," \$211,191.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I simply want to say in reference to the question the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM] asked that there was a hearing held by the Committee on Military Affairs yesterday on a bill to reward the around-the-world flyers, and the Secretary of War appeared before the committee and recommended certain legislation, which was a redraft of a bill which had already been put in, which would give very adequate recognition to the flyers.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. I will say to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM], if the gentleman from Maryland will permit—

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. While I admire these flyers, I am not supporting the bill to give them some special reward for doing something that probably every man in the Air Service would like to have done in their place if he could have had the opportunity. I think it is foolishness to talk about rewarding them. We have not rewarded the distinguished gentleman from Maryland or the distinguished gentleman from New York for the service they performed for their country in the war. We have not rewarded our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SPEAKS], for the very distinguished service he performed during the war. How are we going to end this matter when we start a thing like this? I will say to the gentleman that while I admire the feat they performed under orders of some Army officer, yet I am not willing to pick them out and reward them for something that every other man in the service would have gladly done.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Let me say that there were a good many officers rewarded for what they did during the war in one of the same ways that we propose to reward the flyers in this bill, and it seemed to me a fitting thing to do.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I will.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman kindly favor the committee with a brief statement as to the nature of the reward?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. In the draft of this bill recommended by the Secretary of War, which is a redraft of a bill already introduced by me, they would promote the commanding officer of the group 1,000 files and give 500 files to the remaining officers and promotion to be second lieutenants for the two noncommissioned men in the group who during the flight were acting as reserve officers, having reserve commissions. The bill would further provide for the award of the distinguished-service medal to these officers and men and permission to receive foreign decorations. Then the War Department added a provision by which they would be entitled to retire with 75 per cent pay and with an increase of one grade, as was done with reference to the officers who built the Panama Canal. There is also a provision that their promotion should in no way affect other promotions.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I presumed that the committee would offer this, because I saw where the War Department had outlined the plan. As a matter of fact, the gentleman's committee has favorably reported the bill?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. No; it is in committee.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The gentleman is in favor of it?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I am, personally.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The gentleman proposes to promote some of these men a thousand files.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Captain Smith—

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Because Captain Smith has been a faithful and efficient officer you promote him a thousand numbers, and when you do that do you not demote a thousand men who perhaps are just as faithful as he was by jumping Captain Smith over them?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I do not understand that to be the result.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. What becomes of the thousand men that he jumps?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. They are precisely where they were in the first place.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. They have another man ahead of them, do they not?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. The bill provides that the promotion shall not affect the ordinary promotions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland have two minutes more. I want to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I agree with the gentleman that these intrepid flyers should be rewarded; but does the gentleman believe that he is rewarding these gallant young men when he suggests giving them a distinguished service medal, the same medal that was so freely given, and also given to an officer whom Secretary Hughes, because of an investigation, said should be indicted. Is that honoring these men?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. The same medal and only American decoration that was given General Pershing I consider the highest honor to these men or any other men.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the House, in answer to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], to the fact that the Military Committee was about to take action in regard to this matter. It was before the committee on yesterday, and the same objection that has been raised here was brought forth by that committee. The Committee on Military Affairs for the 10 years that I have been on the committee has never been inclined to take the advice of the Regular Army, and the gentleman from Texas knows that very well.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The "gentleman from Texas" knows a great deal, but that is not within his knowledge. [Laughter.]

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Then the gentleman has not watched what was going on. The Committee on Military Affairs has fought the Regular Army in a great number of matters where the Regular Army has said it was vital for the national defense. That is a well-known fact in this House. I do not know what the committee will do in regard to this question of the advancement for the flyers. It is true, though, that two years ago we passed a law putting all officers of the Army on a single list line of promotion. The object of that law was to do away with any favoritism in the promotion list of the Army. The argument for it was that it would put every man on an equality and there would be no promotion made of anybody out of order. This bill is drafted in such a way that it will not demote anybody, but it will upset, in my opinion, that single list line of promotion. I am inclined to think that it is a very dangerous precedent to start just after we have provided the law to do away with that very thing.

I do not want this taken as an indication that I shall oppose the advancement and citation of the flyers. They have performed a wonderful deed. But it is, as some gentleman has stated, if you start this thing of promoting officers out of the single line list you will not know where you are going to stop in the future.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman give us any information he has with reference to the prospect of early action on this matter leading up to possible action before this Congress expires?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. That is in the minds of several of the Committee on Military Affairs and I will say that I think that some bill will probably be reported to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I do not think, however, that it will be any of the bills so far introduced. I have my individual opinion in regard to it. I think it will probably cite them for distinguished service with a medal or something of that kind. I do not know how far the committee will go with promotions.

Mr. KETCHAM. Whatever bill comes before the committee will undoubtedly have the unanimous consent of that committee?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I doubt that very much. My experience is that the Committee on Military Affairs is rarely unanimous.

Mr. RATHBONE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I will.

Mr. RATHBONE. Having introduced one bill myself covering this matter I would like to ask if the committee has considered providing a financial compensation for these flyers. Has that element been approved?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. No; nothing definite has been done by the committee. This bill was introduced and taken to the committee, and the Secretary of War came to the committee and explained it. That is as far as it has gone. I understand that to-morrow the committee will probably call it up.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL]. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] is unduly sensitive about the Military Committee. I did not mean to imply that the Committee on Military Affairs is any more obsequious toward the departments than most of the other committees of the House. The gentleman seems to have been offended, because he said I had made a charge that the Committee on Military Affairs was about to act on something. I grant you that that was probably unwarranted. [Laughter.] The Committee on Military Affairs, like other committees in this House, as a rule does not act until some department

touches a button and puts the pressure upon it. For instance, the gentleman from Iowa is very much interested in this question of rewarding these gentlemen, as is the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HILL], who has been lying awake nights thinking about rewarding these officers. They believe in the matter strongly, but they did not act, until last week I saw where the Chief of Staff and the Secretary of War and all parties in the department had agreed on a bill. The bill was submitted to the Committee on Military Affairs, and then all at once the Military Affairs Committee realized that this burning issue must be met and acted upon at once, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL], although he bitterly resented the idea that the Military Committee was not watchful, with its teeth and face set like stone against the Regular Army, in explaining admitted that he did not know anything about this measure until the Secretary of War came and explained the bill—a bill fathered not by the department but, I suppose, fathered by the gentleman from Iowa or the gentleman from Maryland. But these gentlemen, in order to get the terms of the bill well into their heads, had to await the benevolent and generous appearance of the Secretary of War before the committee to explain the bill in which these gentlemen and their committee were so wrapped up. So, I take it, that the gentleman was too sensitive when I opined that the committee will act after the department has acted.

Mr. HILL of Maryland rose.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland—but he must keep his hand off his hip pocket, please. [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Oh, I make a special point of not having hip pockets, because they are too suspicious nowadays. Therefore I do not have them put into my clothes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Very well. When the gentleman is unarmed, I am willing to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Let me assure the gentleman that this particular bill, on which a hearing was held yesterday, was introduced a month ago, and the Committee on Military Affairs asked a report upon it from the War Department, as they do on all other things.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I thank the gentleman from Maryland for affirming and clinching my argument. Somebody surreptitiously introduced the bill and then got it before the Committee on Military Affairs, where it slumbered for a whole month. Then the committee wanted to know what was in the bill, what its provisions were, and called on the War Department for a report upon it. The War Department did not introduce the bill. Some gentleman on the Committee on Military Affairs introduced the bill.

Mr. HULL of Iowa rose.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I now yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I did not ask the gentleman to yield.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. Then I yield again to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I merely want to say to the gentleman that the bill was introduced and the War Department was asked to express its opinion. It was not the other way.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Oh, I see.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Yes.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Does the gentleman think the Committee on Military Affairs is any more subject to the indictment than the Foreign Affairs Committee, of which the gentleman from Texas is a member?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Not all. If the gentleman from Iowa had been as attentive to my former remarks as he is at present, he would have noticed that I said a little while ago that I did not make the charge specifically against the Committee on Military Affairs any more than against some other committees in this House. That is the trouble with all of them. They go to sleep.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. That is the trouble with us. Reverting to my remarks in the beginning, I said that if you promoted these officers by giving them a thousand additional numbers you would militate against the interests of a thousand men over whom they were passed. Of course, you will not demote anybody. You will not take captains and make them lieutenants, but you will make every one of a thousand men

one number more distant or remote from the head of the Army, to which each one of them aspires. That is what I say. But the gentleman from Iowa shakes his head.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Yes.

Mr. McSWAIN. In reply to that let me say that they have gotten up a very ingenious device along this line of advancing a thousand men. These men will not be ahead of them, but they will be right alongside of the men, so that if a major becomes a lieutenant colonel, there will be two lieutenant colonels.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I understand now why the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] shakes his head. The gentleman from Iowa shakes his head when he says that that will not remove these thousand numbers any further from the head of the Army, and I thank my friend from South Carolina [Mr. McSWAIN] for explaining, because he says that puts them side by side so that when it comes to making a colonel, instead of making one colonel, both of them being side by side, absolutely on a parity, so that they can not choose between them, and not having Solomon's plan or test of choice there to decide as to which one of the twins shall be favored, the great economist from Iowa creates another place.

They do not need but one colonel, but when they economize they make two colonels. They will make two colonels grow where but one grew before. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GAUGES, DIES, AND JIGS FOR MANUFACTURE

For the development and procurement of gauges, dies, jigs, and other special aids and appliances, including specifications and detailed drawings, to carry out the purpose of section 123 of the national defense act, approved June 3, 1916, as amended by the act approved June 4, 1920, \$50,000.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The paragraph of the bill just read appropriates \$50,000 for the development and procurement of gauges, dies, jigs, and other special aids and appliances, including specifications and detailed drawings, to carry out the purpose of section 123 of the national defense act. As the older Members of the House know, I had much to do with the enactment of section 123 of the national defense act and have taken a deep interest in the appropriations made under it.

This appropriation of \$50,000 is the same amount that was carried last year and is the amount recommended by the Budget. I refer to it now largely because this item is destined to grow in future appropriation bills—and it should grow. In the next appropriation bill there should be \$100,000 instead of \$50,000. The reason for the increase is this: The first work done under this paragraph is necessarily engineering work, designing, producing the drawings, and so forth. Comparatively few can be engaged in this kind of work, and therefore the amount of the appropriation necessary is comparatively small. When designs are prepared and the necessary drawings are made, then, in the interest of economy as well as in the interest of the national defense, we ought to go further and faster in the production of these special appliances.

I shall speak only of gauges, because it is the most important item of those mentioned, and the principle involved in the application of gauges is the same as in the case of the other special appliances. The making of gauges is a very highly skilled art. There are a very limited number of gauge makers in the country—and the number can not be rapidly increased. In case of emergency this work could not be very largely expanded, and if rapidly expanded it would mean that the work would be unskillfully done and, by the same token, costly both in the immediate and after effects. Therefore it is important from every point of view that this work be done in time of peace, when it can be done carefully and at very much less expense than in case of an emergency.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. I will.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. My attention was diverted at the moment. What is the particular use of these gauges and special appliances?

Mr. TILSON. They are absolutely necessary in the production of such munitions of war as must function accurately. For instance, the rifle, the machine gun, the automatic revolver, and the time fuse used in the discharge of a shell must all function with extreme nicety. In the case of any and all of those things that must be produced in very large quantities and yet must function very accurately it is necessary they be fitted and finished with a very great degree of accuracy. In order to do this we must have these precision devices, gauges,

and other appliances that I have referred to in order that the work may be done accurately and at the same time rapidly. If each component in our great ordnance requirement program had to be manufactured by laboratory methods—that is, if each part had to be fitted with a file or some other kind of tool, each part being made separately—the cost would be absolutely prohibitive.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TILSON. I ask to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TILSON. The same principle is used in the making of watches, bicycles, and so forth. Mr. Ford in the manufacture of his automobiles has utilized to a very remarkable degree the principle of the interchangeability of parts. It is that which has made possible the making of watches on such a cheap scale. You can buy a watch for a dollar that will keep excellent time. Why? Because each of the many parts of the watch is made by a precision device, so that all are made just alike.

In other words, one can stamp out rapidly a bushel measure full of each different part and then bring them together and assemble them.

The same is true with respect to munitions, which have to be manufactured in very large quantities. In fact, the principle of interchangeability in manufacture has been developed in the making of ordnance, although it is now applied more largely to the industries of peace than those of war. Nevertheless, it was first begun in the manufacture of muskets. It has been developed in the manufacture of firearms, and now, of course, it is used in all the highly developed industries.

I speak of this matter now because I wish my colleagues to have in mind its great importance to our Military Establishment and so that in case a larger appropriation is called for next year they will not be surprised and will understand that in the end it is a great economy, besides being absolutely essential to a proper degree of preparation for national defense. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LUCE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having under consideration the bill (H. R. 11248) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GRIFFIN, for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. RANKIN, for one day, on account of business.

THE DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD my remarks on the deficiency appropriation bill that was passed to-day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the deficiency appropriation bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the deficiency appropriation bill just passed carries an item of \$150,000,000 to pay back money to income-tax payers whose claims long ago were found to be justly due the taxpayer. The Appropriations Committee is led to believe that this will be sufficient to meet all these claims for such refunds up until December, 1925. It is hoped that the administration or the Treasury Department will use this appropriation for the purpose intended by Congress, and not do as it did with the last appropriation made for this purpose.

In view of certain things that took place in the recent campaign I think it might be well to call attention to certain taxpayers throughout the country, just what happened to them, and the causes thereof.

Last April a deficiency appropriation bill was passed by Congress in the sum of \$105,467,000. This was upon the recommendation of the Treasury Department and for the specific purpose of paying these claims of taxpayers whose money the Government had taken from them illegally and admittedly so,

and had been retaining it from two to three and four years, thus holding it from the taxpayer who needed his money. At the time we made this appropriation we felt justice was being done in a measure at least to a class of outraged income-tax payers. That is chapter one.

We also passed a deficiency appropriation bill of \$16,100,000 to take care of the refunding of 25 per cent of the 1923 taxes which Congress provided should be saved the taxpayers on the taxes paid last year. This tax was legally collected by the Government. In fact, only a small portion had been paid by the taxpayer, as most taxpayers pay their income taxes in installments and were allowed the deduction of 25 per cent on subsequent payments; but, as I have related, we appropriated \$16,100,000 to meet these refunds. This appropriation, however, failed to pass the other branch of Congress; therefore there was no appropriation to meet these few payments and there could not be any such appropriation until the present session of Congress. That is chapter 2.

What happened is a strange and interesting story, which might be well to relate in this concluding chapter. On July 1, there was \$43,405,446.57 balance of the \$105,467,000, with millions of claims of these taxpayers who had been illegally deprived of their money by their Government, unpaid. Although Congress provided this fund to pay them, these taxpayers have been led to believe we did not because they have been told by revenue agents we failed to make the appropriation.

Gentlemen, in view of the fact that such representations have been made to such taxpayers all over the country by these revenue agents and collectors as well as others, and in view of the fact I have many of these outraged taxpayers in my own congressional district who have been and are now blaming me, along with other Congressmen, for this condition, I feel justified in relating these facts and placing the blame where it belongs.

There were 2,576,664 persons affected by the reduction of their taxes of 25 per cent last year, all of them naturally feeling elated over that little gift on the part of Congress, and Congress was entitled to the credit for this reduction, because it never was thought of by the Treasury Department. As already stated, the \$16,100,000 appropriation to enable the administration to pay back what little might have been paid did not pass the other branch of Congress. Evidently it was thought to be far more advantageous for the administration to get into touch with these 2,576,664 taxpaying voters just prior to the election by letters through and by the various revenue collectors throughout the country conveying to them the joyful tidings of what had been done for them by the administration.

In order to do this the Treasury Department took \$17,320,582.74 of that balance of \$43,405,446.57 appropriated, as heretofore stated, to pay these long-standing claims of the taxpayers, whose money had been illegally taken from them, and used it to pay back the taxes legally collected as 1923 taxes, 25 per cent of which Congress made a present to the taxpayer. When this was done it so depleted that appropriation that claims intended by Congress to be paid were not paid.

The administration or the Treasury Department knew it would be a violation of law to take funds appropriated for one purpose and use them for another purpose. They also knew that the entire amount of the \$105,467,000 deficiency appropriation was for the purpose of paying the claims of those whose money had been illegally taken from them, and this was so stated specifically in the bill. So what was done to enable them to get around this and use \$17,320,582.74 of this fund for another purpose? They got the Comptroller General to render an opinion in which that gentleman reached a conclusion that, notwithstanding the fact the appropriation of \$105,467,000 was made to refund taxes illegally collected from the taxpayer, it would not be construed to have a restricted meaning so as to authorize it for that purpose only, but should be so construed as to authorize its use to pay back to the taxpayer money legally collected but not authorized to be retained by the Government. By just what process of reasoning or stretch of imagination he could arrive at such a conclusion it is difficult to understand, but suffice to say it was all that was necessary to enable the administration to take funds appropriated to pay back money that had been illegally extracted from taxpayers and which in many instances had been held by the Government for two, three, and four years and use it for altogether a different purpose.

And that is not all it enabled the administration to do. It enabled it to get in direct communication with 2,576,664 persons just a few weeks before the election, telling them how happy they were that they could make a remittance of 25 per cent of their taxes, all of which is made possible by the

direct order from President Coolidge. I am assuming, of course, that these letters sent out by the administration by and through the various collectors of internal revenue throughout the country were the same as sent out by the revenue collector of my State, as the whole thing seems to have been the carrying out of a well-defined scheme or plan. I have in my State for internal revenue collector a very resourceful or astute politician. It might be well for me to read the letter containing these glad tidings which he sent out. It is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,
Wichita, Kans.

DEAR TAXPAYER: The inclosed check represents a refund of a portion of the Federal income tax paid by you. Such refund is made in accordance with section 1200 of the revenue act of 1924, which provides for a 25 per cent reduction of tax on income received by individuals during the calendar year 1923.

This remittance is made possible at this time by direct order from President Coolidge that funds already appropriated covering refunds should be used in fulfillment of the act.

The records of the collector's office discloses that you paid the full amount of tax upon filing your return for 1923, and it gives the writer pleasure to transmit to you the inclosed remittance.

Yours very truly,

H. H. MOTTER,
Collector of Internal Revenue.

That second paragraph of this letter certainly was a winner. Just think how it sounded to a taxpayer when he read, "This remittance is made possible at this time by direct order from President Coolidge." It might be interesting for you gentlemen to know that I was told on more than one occasion after the receipt of that letter by taxpayers, "Well, the President got busy and reduced our taxes some, even though we couldn't get you fellows in Congress to do anything." That was the impression that letter made on many taxpayers, and it was intended to make that impression, unfair and misleading as it was, and sent out at the expense of the Government. This was a game of the cheapest politics I must admit I ever encountered.

Mind you, there never was a communication sent to the taxpayers, whose money the Government had taken illegally and used for years, that they had been deprived of receiving their money because the administration had used for another purpose the funds Congress had appropriated to pay them.

Gentlemen, I admit I have some feeling in this matter, not based solely on the question that because as a member of the Appropriations Committee I insist that heads of various departments of Government should obey the law and use appropriations for the purpose intended and specified by Congress, which has always been and is now law, but I also have a personal feeling in this matter. All during the campaign in my district I had to meet the attacks and complaints from these taxpayers, whose money the Government had illegally collected, that Congress had failed to make appropriation to pay them back their money, although we were exceedingly anxious to pay back the 25 per cent of the taxes justly and legally collected that year; and when I tried to explain that Congress did make the appropriation, and sufficient appropriation, to pay them back their money I invariably was told that they were informed by the revenue department there were no funds available to pay them because Congress failed to make sufficient appropriation. I knew that Congress had made this appropriation, but never knew the administration had used it for another purpose until a few days ago. I did not know, nor did any other Member of Congress know, this fund had not been used for the purpose for which it was appropriated.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, all I can say under the circumstances in summing up this matter is that there was apparently a game of cheap politics played by one of the departments of the Government and administration and that at the expense of the Government and to the detriment of a certain class of outraged income-tax payers who have been unfairly and shamefully treated.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROSENBLUM, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 8906. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920;

H. J. Res. 259. Joint resolution establishing a commission for the participation of the United States in the observance of the

one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord, authorizing an appropriation to be utilized in connection with such observance, and for other purposes;

S. 648. An act for the relief of Janie Beasley Glisson;

S. 807. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to determine and confirm by patent in the nature of a deed of quitclaim the title to lots in the city of Pensacola, Fla.;

S. 1762. An act providing for the acquirement by the United States of privately owned lands within Taos County, N. Mex., known as the Santa Barbara grant, by exchanging therefor timber, or lands and timber, within the exterior boundaries of any national forest situated within the State of New Mexico;

S. 2559. An act to establish an Alaska game commission to protect game animals, land fur-bearing animals, and birds in Alaska, and for other purposes;

S. 3058. An act giving the consent of Congress to a boundary agreement between the States of New York and Connecticut; and

S. 3584. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Delaware River.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 8, 1925, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

783. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting statement that there is no further necessity for the passage of S. 1033, as the Benning National Forest was established by Executive order of October 3, 1924; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

784. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, transmitting report of the action of the Department of Commerce in respect to accidents sustained or caused by barges while in tow through the open sea during the fiscal year 1924; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Committee on Elections No. 2. A report in the contested election case of Henry Frank v. Fiorello H. LaGuardia (Rept. No. 1082). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HAWES: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 3610. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River near Arrow Rock, Mo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1083). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HAWES: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 3611. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River near St. Charles, Mo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1084). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HAWES: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 3292. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of Hannibal, Mo., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Hannibal, Marion County, Mo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1085). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WYANT: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10030. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Harrisburg Bridge Co., and its successors, to reconstruct its bridge across the Susquehanna River, at a point opposite Market Street, Harrisburg, Pa.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1086). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WYANT: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10277. A bill granting the consent of Congress to Bethlehem Steel Co. to construct a bridge across Humphreys Creek at or near the city of Sparrows Point, Md.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1087). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WYANT: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10412. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railroad Co., its successors and assigns, to construct a bridge across the Little Calumet River; with amendments (Rept. No. 1088). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WYANT: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10413. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the county of Allegheny, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Monongahela River, at or near the borough of Wilson, in the county of Allegheny, in the State of Pennsylvania; with amendments (Rept. No. 1089). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10467. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Huntington & Ohio Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a highway and street-railway bridge across the Ohio River between the city of Huntington, W. Va., and a point opposite in the State of Ohio; with amendments (Rept. No. 1090). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAYBURN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10645. A bill granting consent of Congress to the Valley Bridge Co. for construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande near Hidalgo, Tex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1091). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WYANT: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10648. A bill authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River between the municipalities of Ambridge and Woodlawn, Beaver County, Pa.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1092). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WYANT: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10947. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the county of Allegheny, Pa., to construct a bridge across the Monongahela River in the city of Pittsburgh, Pa.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1093). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WYANT: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 11035. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the county of Allegheny and the county of Westmoreland, two of the counties of the State of Pennsylvania, jointly to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River, at a point approximately 19½ miles above the mouth of the river, in the counties of Allegheny and Westmoreland, in the State of Pennsylvania; without amendment (Rept. No. 1094). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BURTNESS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10532. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Washington to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Columbia River; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1095). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BURTNESS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10533. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Washington to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Columbia River; with amendments (Rept. No. 1096). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BURTNESS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10596. A bill to extend the time for commencing and completing the construction of a dam across the Red River of the North; with amendments (Rept. No. 1097). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BURTNESS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10688. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota to construct a bridge across the Missouri River between Williams County and McKenzie County, N. Dak.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1098). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BURTNESS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10689. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota to construct a bridge across the Missouri River between Mountrail County and McKenzie County, N. Dak.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1099). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BURTNESS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 11030. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, maintenance, and operation of a private drawbridge over and across Lock No. 4 of the canal and locks, Willamette Falls, Clackamas County, Oreg.," approved May 31, 1921; without amendment (Rept. No. 1100). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 11036. A bill extending the time for the construction of the bridge across the Mississippi River in Ramsey and Hennepin Counties, Minn., by the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1101). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DENISON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 9827. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the county of Winnebago, the town of Rockford, and the city of Rockford, in said county, in the State of Illinois, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches

thereto across the Rock River; with amendments (Rept. No. 1104). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Patents. H. R. 8550. A bill to authorize the appointment of a commission to select such of the Patent Office models for retention as are deemed to be of value and historical interest and to dispose of said models, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HUDDLESTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 9820. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Bayou Bartholomew at each of the following-named points in Morehouse Parish, La.: Vester Ferry, Ward Ferry, and Zachery Ferry; with amendments (Rept. No. 1105). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HUDDLESTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 9821. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ouachita River at or near Monroe, La.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1106). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HUDDLESTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 9825. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Great Southern Lumber Co., a corporation of the State of Pennsylvania, doing business in the State of Mississippi, to construct a railroad bridge across Pearl River at approximately 1½ miles north of Georgetown, in the State of Mississippi; with amendments (Rept. No. 1107). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HUDDLESTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10152. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Huntley-Richardson Lumber Co., a corporation of the State of South Carolina, doing business in the said State, to construct a railroad bridge across Bull Creek at or near Eddy Lake, in the State of South Carolina; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1108). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HUDDLESTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10887. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Alabama, through its highway department, to construct a bridge across the Coosa River at Gadsden, Etowah County, Ala., on State road No. 1; with amendments (Rept. No. 1109). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. MCKENZIE: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 3416. An act to authorize the appointment of Thomas James Camp as a major of Infantry, Regular Army; without amendment (Rept. No. 1103). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11341) granting an increase of pension to Amelia Harvey, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 11402) to reimburse the city of Martinsburg, in the State of West Virginia, for the cost of paving Federal property; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 11403) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for fiscal year ending June 30, 1884, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. REED of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 11404) to amend sections 2 and 3 of an act entitled "An act to regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia," approved June 20, 1906; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H. R. 11405) to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to furnish a firing squad to fire the customary salute for any ex-service man; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN: A bill (H. R. 11406) to amend section 601 of the World War adjusted compensation act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEAGALL: A bill (H. R. 11407) to provide for the purchase of a post-office site at Ozark, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TEMPLE: A bill (H. R. 11408) to authorize the Secretary of State to enlarge the site and erect buildings thereon for the use of the diplomatic and consular establishments of the United States in Tokyo, Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 11409) making an adjustment of the fiscal relations between the United States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MCKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 11410) to extend the time for the exchange of Government lands in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEVENSON: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 40) to provide for the printing of a revised edition of the Biographical Congressional Directory; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BUTLER: Resolution (H. Res. 393) for the consideration of H. R. 11282; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STEVENSON: Resolution (H. Res. 394) to authorize the printing of the memorial address on former President Wilson; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. MAPES: Resolution (H. Res. 395) providing for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9629) to provide for the reorganization and more effective coordination of the executive branch of the Government, etc.; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ABERNETHY: Resolution (H. Res. 396) to provide for the printing of "The American Creed" as a public document; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 11411) for the relief of Willis B. Cross; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BEGG: A bill (H. R. 11412) granting an increase of pension to Harriet A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRAND of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 11413) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Corbett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 11414) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the name of Edwin D. Morgan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COLE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 11415) granting a pension to Rebecca J. Rider; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVEY: A bill (H. R. 11416) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Hershberger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 11417) granting an increase of pension to W. H. Henderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 11418) authorizing the Department of State to deliver to the Hon. Henry D. Clayton, district judge of the United States for the middle and northern districts of Alabama, and permitting him to accept the decoration and diploma presented by the Government of France; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOOKER: A bill (H. R. 11419) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Wilder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACOBSTEIN: A bill (H. R. 11420) granting an increase of pension to Priscilla A. Fuller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11421) granting an increase of pension to Lillian M. Walther; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11422) granting an increase of pension to Anne Ryan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11423) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Gibbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 11424) for the relief of Harry Newton; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 11425) to correct the military record of Sylvester De Forest; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 11426) for the relief of Moore L. Henry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KUNZ: A bill (H. R. 11427) to correct the military record of Rocco Pecora; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 11428) granting an increase of pension to Louise Hatch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEWTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 11429) for the relief of Maria Maykovic; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 11430) granting an increase of pension to Michael Malloy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11431) granting an increase of pension to Noah H. Stout; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11432) granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Wilcox; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11433) granting a pension to Laura Sisk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 11434) granting a pension to Newton Seymour; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11435) granting a pension to F. A. Turpin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11436) granting a pension to Alice A. Keith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VAILE: A bill (H. R. 11437) granting a pension to Eva M. Fleck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 11438) granting a pension to Jeremiah Hiatt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 11439) granting an increase of pension to Asa C. Pieratt; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 11440) granting an increase of pension to Sarah S. Vaughan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 11441) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Bates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11442) granting an increase of pension to Matilda J. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11443) granting an increase of pension to Jane Lupton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Resolution (H. Res. 391) to pay to Norman E. Ives \$1,500 for extra and expert services to the Committee on Invalid Pensions by detail from the Bureau of Pensions; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Resolution (H. Res. 392) for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8206; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PERKINS: Resolution (H. Res. 397) for the relief of the widow of Earl D. Hester, late an employee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3374. By Mr. COOK: Petition of H. L. Lansten and 15 others, of Longansport, Ind., against Sunday observance bill (S. 3218); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3375. By Mr. DRANE: Petition of Florida Federation of Womens Clubs, Mrs. Julia A. Hanson, Fort Myers, chairman, Seminole Indian Reservation; Mrs. Charles E. Hawkins, recording secretary, requesting that the appropriation for the Seminole Indians in Florida be increased to \$15,000 annually; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

3376. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Associated Industries of Massachusetts, recommending early and favorable consideration of the Wadsworth-Garrett amendment to the Constitution (S. J. Res. 109; H. J. Res. 68), which provides that all proposed amendments to the Constitution of the United States shall be submitted for ratification to the electors of such State or to a special convention called in each State for that purpose according as each State may determine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3377. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of Colonel E. H. Liscum Garrison, No. 4, Army and Navy Union, favoring the passage of House bill 5934; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3378. By Mr. PHILLIPS: Petition of citizens of New Castle, Pa., protesting against the enactment into law of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3379. By Mr. PRALL: Petition of Colonel E. H. Liscum Garrison, No. 46, Army and Navy Union, Elmira, N. Y., praying for the immediate enactment of House bill 5934 to increase the pensions of Civil and Spanish War veterans and their widows and children; to the Committee on Pensions.

SENATE

THURSDAY, January 8, 1925

(Legislative day of Monday, January 5, 1925)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker of the House had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 648. An act for the relief of Janie Beasley Glisson;

S. 807. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to determine and confirm by patent in the nature of a deed of quitclaim the title to lots in the city of Pensacola, Fla.;

S. 1762. An act providing for the acquirement by the United States of privately owned lands within Taos County, N. Mex., known as the Santa Barbara grant, by exchanging therefor timber, or lands and timber, within the exterior boundaries of any national forest situated within the State of New Mexico;

S. 2559. An act to establish an Alaska game commission to protect game animals, land fur-bearing animals, and birds in Alaska, and for other purposes;

S. 3058. An act giving the consent of Congress to a boundary agreement between the States of New York and Connecticut;

S. 3584. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Delaware River;

H. R. 8906. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920; and

H. J. Res. 259. Joint resolution establishing a commission for the participation of the United States in the observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord, authorizing an appropriation to be utilized in connection with such observance, and for other purposes;

SENATOR FROM CONNECTICUT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the certificate of the Governor of the State of Connecticut certifying to the election of HIRAM BINGHAM as a Senator from that State to fill the unexpired portion of the term ending on the 4th day of March, 1927, which was read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 16th day of December, 1924, Hon. HIRAM BINGHAM was duly chosen, by the qualified electors of the State of Connecticut, a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States to fill the unexpired portion of the term ending on the 4th day of March, 1927.

Witness: His excellency our governor, Charles A. Templeton, and our seal hereto affixed at Hartford this 3d day of January, in the year of our Lord, 1925.

CHAS. A. TEMPLETON, Governor.

By the governor:
[SEAL.]

FRANCIS A. PALLOTTI,
Secretary of State.

SENATOR FROM NEW MEXICO

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair presents a communication from the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BURSUM], which the Clerk will read, and after being read the papers will be filed with the Secretary of the Senate.

The principal legislative clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS,
January 6, 1925.

Hon. ALBERT B. CUMMINS,

President of the Senate, United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Inclosed herewith my notice of contest which has been served upon my opponent, and proof of service thereof attached to the notice. I request that this notice be referred to the appropriate committee.

Sincerely yours,

H. O. BURSUM.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that it has no power to refer the notice to a committee at the